FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 213 4 November 1985

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reagan Issues Statement on New U.S. Arms Proposals AA 1
'Old Commodity, New Wrapping' AA 1
[Bogachev, Chernyshev]
IZFESTIYA Report [3 Nov] AA 2
Speakes Confirms No Change in 'Star Wars' Plan AA 3
U.S. Shows No Interest in Reaching Agreement AA 3
Bogachev Rejects U.S. Figures on Bombers [Kalyagin] AA 4
British Report Notes U.S., Soviet Weapons Parity AA 5
U.S. 'Openly Committed' to Irreversible Arms Race AA 6
[Legantsov]
Soviet Readiness for Test Ban Talks Reiterated AA 7
U.S. Interpretation of ABM Treaty 'Upside Down' AA 7
[Korionov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Nov]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Moscow TV's 2 Nov 'Studio 9' Program CC 1
[Zorin, Arbatov, Shishlin]
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 13
[Zholkver, Kolchanov, Lebedev]
Soviet-U.S. Group Discusses Central America CC 19

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Shultz Travels to Moscow For Pre-Summit Talks A 1
Moscow Arrival A 1
Meets Shevardnadze A 1
IZVESTIYA Publishes Reagan Interview, Comments A 1
Reagan Comment in BBC Interview 'Freudian Slip' A 2
[Posner]
Reagan Preparation for Summit Criticized A 2
[Kalyagin]
Bolshakov Examines Pre-Summit Issues, Activities A 3
[PRAVDA 3 Oct]
Reagan Directs CIA to Overthrow Al-Qadhdhafi A 7
Inquiry Into Leak Ordered A 7

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further Reportage on Lao Defense Minister's Visit E 1
Meets With Aliyev, Kulikov E 1
Speaks Over Moscow Radio E 1
Departs for Novosibirsk E 1
Malaysian Prime Minister Receives Ryabov Delegation E 2
SRV Newspaper Praises USSR Development Aid E 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Grishin at Opening of CSSR-Aided Metro Station F 1
Meeting With Beranek [Bratislava] F 1
Sokolov, Others Meet CSSR Army Political Workers F 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Nov]
Zaykov, Bulgaria's Doynov Discuss Cooperation F 2
BCP Politburo Approves Gorbachev Visit Results F 2
[IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]
Lawyers Say Rome Trial Charges Unsubstantiated F 3
Antonov Case Said Example of Rights Violations F 3

WESTERN EUROPE

Text of Gorbachev Letter to Kohl Disclosed [DPA] G 1
Austrian Finance Minister Visits Uzbek SSR G 1
UK Participation in SDI Development Defined G 2
[Ilyashenko]
Comments on Netherlands Missile Deployment Decision G 3
Contradicts National Interests G 3
[Kovalev]
Changes Strategic Situation G 3
[Ignatov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Nov]
Public Protests [Alekseyev] C 4
Belgians Demonstrate Against Cruise Deployment G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Husayn Stresses Need for Comprehensive Settlement H 1
Urges Soviet Participation H 1
Calls for International Conference H 1
Further Reportage on Brutents Visit to Syria H 1
Meets With Syrian CP Leaders H 1
Discussion With Qaddah [Damascus] H 1
Makes Statement on Mideast [Paris] H 2
Report on Return of Kidnapped Diplomats H 3
IZVESTIYA Report Details Diplomats' Kidnapping H 3
Journalist Denies Report on Mass Emigration H 4
[MA'ARIV 1 Nov]
Arab Communist Parties Censure Israeli Policy H 5
Georgia SSR Official Arrives in Baghdad [INA] H 5
Ambassador Marks Algerian Revolution Anniversary H 6
Council of Ministers Greets YAR Premier H 6
[IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]
Losev Sees U.S. Obstructing Mideast Settlement H 7
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Nov]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Further Reportage on Mengistu Visit to Moscow J 1
1 Nov 'Conversation' [PRAVDA 3 Nov] J 1
Gorbachev Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 3 Nov] J 1
Mengistu Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 3 Nov] J 4
Mengistu Visits Lenin Mausoleum J 9
Leaders Underline Ties [Addis Ababa] J 9

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

CPSU Delegation Leaves Venezuela Following Congress K 1
[PRAVDA 31 Oct]
Aristov Meets With Cuban Vice Trade Minister K 1
[PRAVDA 1 Nov]
Presidium Greets Mexican President on National Fete K 1
[IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]
Nicaragua Condemns U.S. Policy, Economic Sanctions K 2

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Sakharov's Wife to Depart 'End of November' [AFP] R 1
Reportage, Comment on Draft CPSU Statutes R 1
PRAVDA Editorial [3 Nov] R 1
Changes Discussed [Lukyanenko] R 4
Comment on Statutes [Prague] R 5
TASS Explanation R 6
Academician on Significance R 7
Zimyanin Voronezh Speech Reported R 7
[PRAVDA 28 Oct]
Sokolov to Review GOSR Parade on 7 Nov R 10
RSFSR Supreme Soviet to Meet 3 Dec R 10
Yeltsin Visits Astrakhan, Construction Sites R 10
Council of Ministers Appointments Reported R 11
Silayev as Deputy Premier R 11
Murakhovskiy as Deputy Chairman R 11
Antonov Named Envoy to CEMA R 11

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmonauts Continue Flight Program Experiments U 1
Scientists To Explore Antarctica's D Cupola U 1
Academy of Sciences Presidium Meets 31 Oct U 2
Briefs: Laptev Sea Exploration; U 2
Nuclear Power Institute Opens;
Yerevan Atomic Energy Meeting

REAGAN ISSUES STATEMENT ON NEW U.S. ARMS PROPOSALS

'Old Commodity, New Wrapping'

LD011402 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 1 Nov 85

["Old Commodity in a New Wrapping?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, November 1 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev and Vladimir Chernyshev write:

At a press conference in the White House, President Ronald Reagan of the United States has come forward with a statement on new U.S. proposals at the talks on nuclear and space arms. According to the President, the purpose of the proposals is to contribute to achieving real cuts in nuclear arms, to strengthening stability and to solving problems with due regard for the legitimate interests of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The President did not concretize the essence of the U.S. proposals, referring to the confidentiality of the talks. However, spokesmen of his administration immediately revealed a number of concrete details of the proposals, hurrying to publicize their ostensibly "constructive character". Juding by the commentaries of the U.S. press and television, the "leak" of information on the U.S. proposals was of an organized and purposeful character.

THE NEW YORK TIMES points out that Reagan in point of fact is putting forward a variation of his old proposals on reducing offensive strategic arms, without substantially changing his stand as to carrying on with the U.S. space-based anti-missile defence system which has been dubbed the "star wars" program.

According to explanations by Washington officials, the United States suggests cutting down the number of warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) and submarine-launched balliatic missiles (SLBM's) to the level of 4,500 for each side. The number of warheads on ICBM's should not exceed 3,000.

Noteworthy is the assertion by U.S. official spokesmen that in the field of nuclear arms reductions the USA ostensibly goes farther than is suggested by the Soviet Union. They point out that the USSR suggests that 6,000 warheads by left on nuclear weapons delivery vehicles whereas the USA suggests a lesser amount -- 4,500. In so doing the U.S. spokesmen pass it over in silence that the Soviet proposals at the talks on strategic nuclear arms cover a wide range of such systems including, in particular, all the three elements of the strategic "triad" (ICBM's, SLBM's and heavy bombers) of each of the sides.

The U.S. proposal covers only two elements of the "triad" -- the ICMB's and SLBM's, i.e. 4,500 warheads will remain only on part of nuclear systems. Taking into account all the other nuclear systems, the aggregate number of warheads will be much larger after cutbacks effected according to the U.S. scheme.

A question arises: Why is the third element of the triad -- the strategic bombers -- excluded from the estimates of overall nuclear potentials subject to reduction? Each of U.S. heavy bombers, of which there are 509 in the USA, is capable of carrying 20-28 long-range cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. Apart from the bombers, there also exist other nuclear weapons delivery vehicles which are capable of reaching the territory of other side such as medium-range and forward-based weapons.

Why does not the USA include all those systems in the strategic balance?

As regards those systems, Washington has not gone beyond quite vague promises to tackle the questions of limiting them separately.

Further, the President in his statement asserts that the U.S. proposals equally take into account the interests of the USA and the USSR. However, as follows from explanations by spokesmen for his administration, Ronald Reagan suggests establishing a compulsory sublevel for a number of warheads only on one element of the "triad" -- the ICBM's, i.e. for those systems which constitute the basis of the strategic potential of the USSR. No though restrictions are set for the systems in which the USA is strong -- the SLBM's and heavy bombers. How can one maintain that the interests of each of the sides are taken into account? There are grounds to draw a conclusion that Washington's old aim of gaining one-sided advantages at the negotiating table has not undergone any changes.

It is appropriate to recall that, according to the Soviet proposals, the stationing of more than 60 percent of the overall established number of nuclear warheads is not allowed on any of the elements of the "triad" after reductions are effected.

The head of the White House, publicizing the U.S. proposals, stated that they cover all the three fields which are under discussion at the talks in Geneva, i.e. space weapons, strategic arms and medium-range nuclear systems. However, as follows from his further pronouncements, Washington does not at all intend to abandon its "star wars" program but presupposes to continue to limit itself to explaining those deadly "benefits" which mankind would get as a result of the militarization of outer space.

Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger, interpreting the U.S. proposals, has asserted that the USA is ostensibly prepared to give up any types of arms in the interests of reaching agreements which would be verifiable and would ensure parity. However, he immediately hurried to add that the United States does not intend to give up the Strategic Defence Initiative or to hold talks on it.

Without solving the question of preventing militarization of outer space, it is simply senseless to speak of any limitations on and reductions in nuclear arms.

The U.S. CBS television network reports that the U.S. proposals do not envisage a freeze on work on new weapon systems. Thus, unlike the Soviet Union, the United States virtually comes out against taking effective measures with a view to curbing the nuclear arms race.

Summing up the essence of the U.S. proposals, most Western observers agree that they are based on the USA's same old principles which have failed to lead to progress at the talks in Geneva up to now and which have brought them to a deadlock. It is pointed out, in particular, that Ronald Reagan's proposals are in point of fact the USA's old proposals which have been slightly modified and presented in a new wrapping.

IZVESTIYA Report

FM021948 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In A Different Wrapping"]

[Text] Washington, 2 Nov -- U.S. President R. Reagan has made a statement at a White House press conference on the new U.S. proposals at the talks on nuclear and space weapons. Although he did not specify their nature, referring to the confidentiality of the talks, administration spokesmen immediately revealed a number of details of these proposals.

As THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, in them Reagan "has not changed his position regarding the continuation of the U.S. program of space-based ABM defense, which has become known as the 'star wars' program." "He made it plain that the new U.S. proposals do not envisage the United States ending its research within the framework of his program," the paper notes, stressing that the White House boss maintains a "resolute commitment" to its implementation.

This was also confirmed by M. Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, who said in an interview for the ABC television company that the implementation of the "star wars" program "will be continued."

The CBS television company notes the U.S. proposals do not envisage freezing the work of new weapons systems. "Some U.S. Administration officials," the company points out, "admit the U.S. proposals are essentially the old U.S. plan in a new wrapping."

SPEAKES CONFIRMS NO CHANGE IN 'STAR WARS' PLAN

LD012252 Moscow TASS in English 2229 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, November 2 TASS -- Larry Speakes, deputy White House press secretary, has confirmed that the proposals tabled Friday by the Administration at nuclear and space arms talks do not provide for any change in the U.S. stand towards the "star wars" programme. At a meeting with journalists in the White House he said that there were no changes in them concerning the approach to the "Strategic Defense Initiative".

U.S. SHOWS NO INTEREST IN REACHING AGREEMENT

LD032040 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Nov 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpt] The U.S. magazine HUMAN EVENTS asked U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger in what event he would consider the Soviet-U.S. summit successful. Weinberger answered that the Russians must understand the U.S. President does not intend to give up his Strategic Defense Initiative, his "star wars" plans. If they realize that and then agree to discuss ways of reducing offensive weapons, then, he said, it will be successful. But, we should add, a success only for the Pentagon. Weinberger, like other figures in the U.S. Administration, is well aware of the Soviet position. We have repeatedly pointed out that if there is no ban on the militarization of outer space there will be no agreement on the limitation of nuclear weapons. This point of view is based on an extremely responsible appraisal, taking into consideration both our interests and the interests of the United States. We are planning to hold talks only on the principles of equality.

Many people in the world are awaiting a constructive reply from the White House to the latest major proposals put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev which envisage a truly radical reduction of nuclear weapons. Up to the very last moment the U.S. side delayed its reply. The fact, evidently, is that Washington does not want to accept the Soviet initiative, but to turn them down offhand is not simple either. Their international prestige is too great. For it is a question of a unique opportunity to achieve an historic agreement which would mark the beginning of a world-wide process of disarmament.

True, 2 days ago, the United States presented its counterproposals. Their details are not yet known. They were presented confidentially for examination by the Soviet delegation to the talks in Geneva.

But judging by reports in the U.S. press, Washington has not given up its "star wars" program and is again insisting on limitation primarily of those types of nuclear weapons which serve as the basis of our strategic defense. At the same time, it is trying to exempt from limitation those weapons in which the United States has superiority. If this is so, then it is a question of another attempt by the U.S. Administration to achieve one-sided advantages.

As the CBS television company noted, it is the previous U.S. plan, but in a new package. But even so, the White House has made the possibility of achieving agreement more complicated. The U.S. President is giving priority at the coming summit talks to settlement of regional conflicts. In this way he intends to avoid the problem of disarmament, on which the U.S. side apparently feels itself in a vulnerable position. Moreover, Washington understands the settlement of regional problems, to put it mildly, in a one-sided way, as the imposition of its own ultimatum-like conditions upon states which have embarked on the road of progressive development. The White House would like, for instance, the Sandinist government of Nicaragua to start talks on power sharing with bands of contras, and the Government of Democratic Afghanistan with the dushmans. And at the same time, it is also demanding our cooperation.

I think even Washington hardly takes such proposals seriously. So why does it make them? Is it not to set up additional obstructions?

Of course, the existence of different approaches should not be a hinderance to talks if each side has an interest in reaching agreement, but the United States has yet to demonstrate such an interest. So far it is not visible.

Meanwhile, intensive preparations for the meeting continue. On 4 November U.S. Secretary of State Shultz is coming to Moscow. He will have talks with USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. As long as there is the slightest chance of halting the arms race it must be used.

BOGACHEV REJECTS U.S. FIGURES ON BOMBERS

LD021405 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1253 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS) -- TASS observer on military affairs, Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Disregarding the confidential character of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, reports continue to "leak" into the Western press, with references to official circles, about the proposals the United States has put forward in Geneva. In a number of cases, the information about these proposals bears a one-sided character and abounds with terminological and numerical inaccuracies hindering their evaluation. Nevertheless, on a number of issues being discussed in Geneva it is possible to form a certain picture of the U.S. position at the talks.

Thus, the UPI news agency, with a reference to officials in Washington, reports the U.S. side is proposing to reduce the numbers of heavy bombers of each side to an "equal level" of 350 units. What the U.S. side understands by "equal level" in the instance given, requires some explanation.

It is well-known that in 1979 the United States had 576 strategic bombers while the Soviet Union had 156. This fact was recorded in the appendix to the SALT II treaty and was confirmed by the signatures of the leaders of the USSR and the United States. At present, the number of such bombers on both sides is somewhat lower than 6 years ago. In implementing the replacement of B-52 bombers by new systems, the United States has been converting the old aircraft launchers of nuclear weapons to carry oout auxiliary tasks.

As reported by the London Strategic Research Institute, by autumn this year the number of U.S. aircraft converted to perform "non-nuclear tasks" only amounted to 61 aircraft. The number of U.S. strategic bombers now stands at 509 units. At present, the Soviet Union has approximately 150 strategic aircraft.

According to UPI, the U.S. side in putting forward the proposal to reduce the numbers of USSR and U.S. heavy bombers to "equal levels" intends to proceed from the position that the United States now has allegedly not 509 strategic bombers, but only 260. What is more, this number includes, it is said, old U.S. aircraft "in the hangars." It emerges in accordance with the latest Pentagon calculations that in 6 years the United States has allegedly removed over 300 (!) strategic bombers from service. This is a quite improbable premise that cannot be confirmed even by the most fantastic stretching of the facts.

U.S. officials, on the other hand, are asserting that the number of Soviet strategic bombers has supposedly increased during that time to "roughly 300." The UPI agency explains this "increase" through the inclusion of Soviet "Backfire bombers" into the strategic balance, although, by the admission of the same officials from Washington, they only have a moderate range and for long-distance flights "they need to be refuelled in the air."

It is appropriate to recall that according to the SALT II treaty it is forbidden to equip "Backfire" bombers with mechanisms to refuel in the air and up to now even the most frenzied falsifiers from the Pentagon have not brought themselves to assert the USSR is violating this commitment. Incidentally, quite recently THE NEW YORK TIMES reported the Pentagon's intelligence directorate "carried out a reevaluation" of the operating range of the Soviet "Backfire" bomber. This fact, the newspaper stressed, "prompts one to query the U.S. Administration's decision to consider the "Backfire" as a part of the Soviet arsenal of long-range nuclear weapons."

The Washington administration has just not given an answer to the questions of the unlikely "reduction" of U.S. bombers over 6 years, just as it has not replied to questions about the no less fantastic data about the "growth" of the Soviet strategic air force over that same period.

Washington's manipulations of figures leads one to think that in putting forward their proposal on equal levels of long-range airplanes, the United States has no intention at all of reducing its own strategic bombers, although their number if over three times in excess of the Soviet quantity of airplanes.

BRITISH REPORT NOTES U.S., SOVIET WEAPONS PARITY

LD022138 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2033 GMT 2 Nov 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] London -- The International Institute for Strategic Studies has published a report whose conclusions refute official Washington's claims that the United States is lagging behind the USSR in the military-strategic sphere. A press release issued in connection with the report's publication states there is approximate equality between the USSR and the United States in the area of strategic nuclear weapons.

U.S. 'OPENLY COMMITTED' TO IRREVERSIBLE ARMS RACE

LD011025 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, November 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Legantsov reports: The Washington administration is bent on pushing ahead with its "star wars" program, while simultaneously building up its first-strike strategic nuclear capability, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger indicated in his statement in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Pentagon chief claimed that the United States needed to create a fundamentally new antiballistic missile defense system with space-based elements (with whose help it intends to acquire a possibility to escape retaliation after dealing a first strike -- TASS) not only to "deter deliberate attack" but also avert an accidental outbreak of war. He said the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative was very important to U.S. long-term security interests.

But, according to Weinberger's twisted logic, increasing the U.S. "defensive" capability should be accompanied with increases in its offensive capability. "As we seek to achieve a strategic order based on defense," he said, "we must not neglect our offensive deterrent systems." The Pentagon chief added that the United States and its NATO allies would continue modernizing their armed forces. It followed plainly from the defense secretary's statement that, while claiming a desire to strengthen peace through reliance on defense, the U.S. Administration will carry out plans to build and deploy MX and Midgetman intercontinental ballistic missiles, Trident nuclear submarines, Trident-2 nuclear submarine-launched ballistic missiles and B-1 and Stealth strategic bombers.

The defense secretary's statement vividly demonstrated the true worth of Washington's professed "special commitment" to enhancing international peace and security. It is instead openly committed to making irreversible the process of militarizing outer space and the nuclear offensive arms race.

SOVIET READINESS FOR TEST BAN TALKS REITERATED

PM011631 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Tolkunov dispatch: "Disarmament -- the Command of the Times"]

[Excerpts] New York, 31 Oct -- In line with the continuing general debate on questions of disarmament a discussion of specific points on the agenda has begun in the First Committee of the 40th UN General Assembly session.

The work of the First Committee shows that the constructive thrust of the Warsaw Pact states' statement is consonant with the mood of the overwhelming majority of states. The idea that the cardinal task of our time is to halt the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, and proceed to disarmament is reflected in the speeches by representatives of not only the socialist and nonaligned countires, but also a number of Western states. "Either we draw up effective disarmament agreements, or the threat to peace and security will grow," Australian delegate R. Butler declared.

The discussion centers on the need to prevent an arms race in space and freeze nuclear arms and on the rejection of the use of nuclear weapons. In this connection many speakers emphasized the special urgency of the task of ending and banning nuclear weapon tests.

The Soviet Union, USSR representative F.F. Petrovskiy pointed out, took the first step and announced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions as of 6 August.

If Washington's response is positive, the USSR will adhere to the moratorium even after 1 January 1986. A bilateral Soviet-U.S. moratorium could be a dress rehearsal for a multilateral test ban treaty.

Our country, the Soviet delegate said, is ready at any moment to resume the tripartite talks on this question with the United States and Britain, which were broken off in 1980, not through the Soviet Union's fault. The USSR also advocates commencing talks on this problem within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

U.S. INTERPRETATION OF ABM TREATY 'UPSIDE DOWN'

PM011622 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Nov 85 p 3

[Political observer Vitaliy Korionov's "Review of Events": "Standing Everything on Its Head"]

[Text] Just over 2 weeks separate us from the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Naturally, millions of people in all corners of the planet are focusing increasing attention on how the two great powers are approaching the meeting.

The position of the CPSU and the Soviet State is clear. The CPSU is in favor of normal and stable relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, the new draft of the CPSU Program emphasizes. "Objective preconditions exist for the establishment of fruitful, mutually advantageous Soviet-U.S. cooperation in various spheres," this document says. "It is the CPSU's conviction that the policy of both powers must be oriented toward mutual understanding and not toward enmity, which entails the threat of catastrophic consequences not only for the Soviet and U.S. peoples, but for other peoples as well."

Motivated by noble and sincere intentions, the Soviet Union has recently put forward new, large-scale, constructive peace initiatives which are aimed at ensuring the most favorable climate possible for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The Soviet proposals lay the foundation for a way out of the blind alley into which the whole world is deliberately pushed by those circles in the United States which dislike the normalization of the international situation and which would like military superiority over the USSR at all costs.

The Soviet initiatives have placed the Washington "war party" in a difficult position. The placemen of the military-industrial complex are striving to preserve at all costs the international tension which offers an opportunity to reap exorbitant profits from the arms race it has unleashed. But they are finding it increasingly difficult to implement their sinister schemes, because the new Soviet peace proposals have capitivated the minds and hearts of the broadest strata of peoples in all corners of the earth. The USSR's realistic and constructive stance also exerts a certain influence on prudent circles in the ruling camp in Western Europe, which cannot fail to understand the deadly calamity that threatens Europe if the transatlantic "madmen" succeed in implementing their misanthropic schemes. Those strata in the United States itself, which have a realistic outlook on life, cannot but give the matter deep thought. It is well known that the voice of scientists, sober-minded politicians, congressmen, former military men, and church representatives can be heard increasingly loudly in the United States, warning against the disastrous consequences of the "hawks'" course.

Hence the differences of opinion which have been clearly perceptible in Washington over the past few weeks. R. Reagan is subject to the strongest possible pressure by bosses of the military-industrial complex and their spokesmen in the higher echelons of power, primarily such Pentagon officials as C. Weinberger and R. Perle.

On the other hand, some government officials, primarily in the Department of State, who are forced to take into account the moods in Western Europe, are trying to declare it is impossible to march on regardless; that a certain caution is needed in the implementation of the present administration's militarist program.

This confusion became particularly obvious regarding the issue of the so-called "new interpretation" of the unlimited-duration Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems, concluded in 1972. To a certain extent, this treaty ties the hands of those forces which would like to open all floodgates for the transformation of space into an arena of war.

The launching of the trial balloon was assigned to R. McFarlane, the President's assistant for national security affairs (a Pentagon officer in the past). Speaking on ABC-TV's "Meet the Press," McFarlane proclaimed: A new "reading" of the ABM Treaty text has led to the discovery that this treaty not only does not ban but, on the contrary, permits and sanctions not only the testing, but also the development [razrabotka] of ABM systems on the basis of so-called "new physical concepts" (in other words, such ABM means as laser weapons, particle-beam weapons, and so on).

This is an obvious falsification of the ABM Treaty, since its Article I binds the sides "Not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of the territory of its country and not to create [sozdavat] a base for such defense," and Article V -- "not to develop [sozdavat], test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

R. McFarlane is not, of course, a "one-man band." Other "hawks" have joined the campaign against the ABM Treaty simultaneously with him. Pentagon chief Weinberger has openly demanded "to review the possibility of a real break with the ABM Treaty." General Abrahamson, leader of the organization for the implementation of the "star wars" program, dislikes the aforementioned treaty so much, he declared in an interview with Italian newspaper IL TEMPO: "The United States did something incredible in 1972. We agreed to leave the population of our country, or rather the population of our countries, our culture, our society, and our ideals totally defenseless against the incredibly powerful threat originiating from the Soviet Union...."

After these revelations things became too much even for "respected" press organs in the United States. Thus, an editorial article appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES under the meaningful headline "Shadow Over the Summit," which states: "For 13 years the treaty was interpreted by everyone in the way it was formulated: any space-based ABM system was banned. But now it is being claimed that the treaty means the opposite; that 'impermissible' means 'permissible,' and that 'below' means 'above.'" The authors of the article, making a dismissive gesture, state: "Everything has been turned upside down."

"We are striking a blow against the ABM Treaty just a few weeks before going into a summit and after receiving the new Soviet arms control proposal," was how the administration's position was described by a figure as well acquainted with this problem as G. Smith, former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. SALT I talks. The administration's interpretation, Smith warns, is "turning the treaty into a dead letter."

The Washington "discoveries" have confused even such faithful followers of the White House as British Prime Minister M. Thatcher and FRG Chancellor H. Kohl. The United States' West European NATO allies have set about trying to persuade Washington not to go too far. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, was "furious" that McFarlane had made a public "interpretation" of the ABM Treaty.

The press reported that a "stormy and protracted" meeting of the highest ranking representatives was held in the White House, at which a "judgment of Solomon" was adopted. They agreed that repudiating McFarlane's statement would mean putting him and the administration in an "awkward position" and therefore, the newspapers announced, "Reagan made a new decision that, although the administration was agreed on a more flexible interpretation of the treaty, it intended as one of the principles of its policy to continue to adhere to the more limited interpretation which it accepted in the past." But after this, the "superhawk" R. Perle immediately announced: "Reagan's decision to adhere to the previous limited interpretation is of a temporary nature." The Republican Senator J. Chafee of Rhode Island states: "There is a danger that the United States will change course again at any moment."

Thus, the "madmen" are fiercely opposed to any step which might defuse tension. This must be taken into account since they have their hands on important levers and are ensconced in extremely influential posts. Here is an example: The leader of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space talks which are being held in Geneva is Max Kampelman. Who is he?

M. Kampelman works for a firm which acts as the Washington middleman for Lockheed Corporation, 85 percent of whose profits are accounted for by military output. Lockheed has become $30 billion richer thanks to contracts linked with the "star wars" program. The corporation has concluded yet another contract with the Pentagon stipulating that by 1990 Lockheed create [predusmatrivayushchiy sozdaniye] for the U.S. military department a new system for the "star wars" program. There is therefore every reason to doubt Kampelman's efforts in Geneva are aimed at reaching agreement with the USSR on preventing the militarization of space. No, the prime subject of his constant concern is to expedite tests of the Lockheed nuclear missile.

However, Kampelman is just the tip of the iceberg. More than 77 percent of the contracts for "star wars" projects have gone to corporations in states whose representatives in Congress head or sit on committees resolving questions of the distribution of military contracts, such as the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee [name of subcommittee as published]. After this, need one be surprised that the corporations generously assign millions of dollars to the election campaigns of members of the House of Representatives in a position to decide who gets military orders?

That is how and by whom "high-level policy" in the United States is made. Everything here has indeed been "turned upside down."

MOSCOW TV'S 2 NOV 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW021035 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0600 GMT 2 Nov 85

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet Television and Radio; with Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting with you again in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center in our traditional talk devoted to topical problems of world politics. Taking part in our program today are academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin.

The fall of this year has turned out to be particularly full of events of paramount international affairs: the visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to France, and the most important proposals directed at the suspension of the arms race that he made during this visit; the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states, which adopted a statement for the removal of the nuclear threat and a turn for the better in European and world affairs; Comrade Gordachev's visit to Bulgaria; and the 40th jubilee session of the UN General Assembly.

All these were events of paramount international importance; and although each has its own specific nature and composition, a common thread unites them: the desire to take effective measures which could deflect the threat hanging over mankind. It is obvious to every sensible person that a serious change is now needed in international affairs, that to go on like this is impossible, and that mankind has come to an extremely dangerous limit.

Geneva Summit

I think that, strictly speaking, this circumstance gave rise to the need for an event which is taking place this month; I mean the meeting, at the highest level, between the leaders of our country and the United States in Geneva. As you know, this meeting will take place on 19-20 November.

In this connection, the question arises, with which I would like to begin our talk today. I think that this meeting was perhaps impossible 1 year or 18 months ago -- at any rate if we take into account, not the nature of protocol, but a practical meeting for solving matters, and the existing circumstances in international affairs. But now it has become a political reality. Georgiy Arkadyevic; why?

[Arbatov] One thing that is certain is that this objective necessity for some sort of turning point or change in the entire course of international affairs -- which, strictly speaking, existed 18 months ago -- has become even more obvious and urgent. But, of course, for an objective need, including this one, to turn into practical deeds, one also needs a political will, the political will of those who must take part in a certain event -- in this case the United States and the Soviet Union.

If we talk about the United States, I would say that recently -- beginning last year precisely with the election campaign, but particularly the last few months -- this necessity and requirement that something must be done and the understanding that the matter is approaching quite dangerous events and changes, has gathered strength. It has gathered strength, and this, strictly speaking, was noticed earlier, last year during the election campaign.

Now, I would like cite a very interesting article by former U.S. President Nixon, who, I think, most briefly and correctly defined the reason why dialogue, and particularly summit meetings, are necessary.

This reason is survival. If one is to ensure survival, that is, to prevent nuclear war, one needs talks, objective and practical talks, to solve practical problems. This has begun to get through to the Reagan administration. And generally quite painful for it have become the rebukes of critics that it would be likely that Reagan would be the first U.S. President in the last 50 years not to meet with Soviet leaders and not to have had serious talks with them about problems dividing the two sides, about world problems, about what needs to be done in general, and so on.

I think that it has gotten through to the administration that it needs a meeting, no matter what policy it conducts afterwards. If the danger of the situation has indeed gotten through to it, and it understands that, if the course of events further develops like this, it could lead to a very tragic finale, then this meeting is needed to somehow outline paths leading to a way out of the deep rut in which American policy has found itself in recent years, to of course find a way out together with the Soviet Union, and to find mutually acceptable solutions.

[Arbatov continues] But, even if the administration wants to continue its former policy, it also needs a meeting. It needs one so that at least it can say to its critics, both within and outside the country, that it has done everything. In this case, the meeting can then be broken off, and then, of course, everything will be done to propagandistically support this action and argue that it was not the United States which broke off the meeting, but the same atheistic communism, the same Russians.

I think that this was one reason that pushed the United States to this decision about a meeting. The other was the struggle, the persistent and acute struggle which is being waged around questions of Soviet-American relations and the problems connected with them -- strictly speaking, the most fundamental problems, the problems of peace and the arms race.

This struggle is being waged simultaneously at a number of levels. One of these is the Reagan Administration itself. Of course, the matter here looks very distinctive. It is not a struggle between moderates and extremists, between doves and hawks, as they say. It is rather a struggle between the extreme right and the far right. Although I would way that even these distinctions cannot after all be ignored, they too may play a certain role.

However, I think even more important than this struggle is the one being waged within the ruling class, what are called U.S. ruling circles. I mean precisely monopolistic capital and the political elite and those who surround them. In general, the position of these ruling circles has also noticeably moved to the right, which has incidentally given rise to great concern even among U.S. allies and among many Americans, because they are afraid that this drift to the right will ultimately place America in a position of isolation; that is, will isolate America from the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, the distinction here is much more clearly pronounced and more substantial than within the administration. Here there are many very serious forces and specific people who understand that the American position is not adequate to the realities ... [corrects himself] the present American policy is not adequate to the realities of the world, and that it must be made to correspond with these realities, including economic ones, because an entire chain is created here: enormous military spending linked to a large deficit, linked to the national debt. All this threatens serious financial upheavals and social upheavals.

I happened to be in the United States recently, in September, and talked with a number of major specialists on the American economy, and to major financiers. Many of them expect a possible catastrophe within the next 2 or 3 years if things go the way they are going now.

U.S. 'Struggle' With Allies

Then there is a struggle within American public opinion, although the antinuclear movement in America has become somewhat more passive. It managed to be deceived in some things. There are probably some objective reasons for this, but, on the whole, serious conflicts are coming to a head, which are moreover tied to social and foreign policy problems.

Finally, there is a serious struggle being waged within the very alliance of capitalist countries, between America and her allies. I think that tension here has reached an unprecedented scale in the fund of military history, although all this is concealed by outward solidarity. It proceeds along quite a few lines. All these lines of struggle and tension being created also push, and have pushed, the American Administration into finding a way that would lead to a summit meeting.

[Shishlin] On the whole, you can probably say it in that way -- rushing in with a no to the possibility of a Soviet-U.S. dialogue would have meant a serious mistake for the U.S. Administration...

[Zorin interrupts] ...and political isolation...

[Shishlin] Yes, and serious political losses...

[Arbatov interrupts] All the more so against the background of the great approval with which the initiatives were met...

Reactions to SDI

[Shishlin] This is precisely what I wanted to talk about, and deal with the issue of the political scene, which I cannot say has become better or more stable in the last year to 18 months, but it has begun indeed to change substantially in some aspects. To a large extent it is connected with the extensive Soviet initiatives and the actions undertaken by the Soviet Union for smoothing international relations. In this connection, I would like to remind those watching our program about the Soviet Union's resolute condemnation of the program which is designated SDI. This clear and principled position was very much to the point, and ensured proper conclusions were drawn about the Soviet Union's stand and its approach to the sensitive issue of one's own, and international, security.

I have in mind our actions, such as unilateral moratoria on antisatellite weapons, the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear arms, nuclear tests, any nuclear tests. Of course, all this had an effect on the political climate, and yet the question could be asked: If you look at U.S. reaction to the Soviet initiatives, you can easily see that it has been especially negative. The Americans rejected the Soviet examples of goodwill and, in fact, pulled in an entirely different direction. Well, does that mean that the Soviet initiatives were useless? There is no doubt that they were not. The recent appeal by six leaders of various states to U.S. President Reagan and the CPSU Central Committee general secretary is very interesting, and not simply because of the political activity demonstrated by these leaders, but by the ideas they expressed. On the whole, these ideas are in harmony with the political aspirations, which are characteristic of our country, socialist states, the Nonaligned Movement, neutrals and, in general, the widest circles of the international community and different political forces.

I think that as we discuss the issue of why there was no U.S. rejection of Soviet-U.S. direct dialogue at the highest level, it is probably appropriate to take into consideration the substantial intensification over the last few months of political dialogue between our country and what is normally called Western countries. You know, comrades, about the serious and substantial results -- we have already reminded you about the visit -- Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to France. It was significant, not only for Soviet-French bilateral relations. Its political echo is protracted. I think that, in this connection, it is noteworthy to mention a report from Japan about the great interest being shown by Japanese political circles, including Prime Minister Nakasone, about direct contacts with the Soviet leadership. Actually, high-level contacts with Japan have already been planned for the coming few months. That is also a new element in the world political scene. I think that it is worth noting that the sharp worsening of problems in what is sometimes called the Third World is characteristic of the current world political picture. That includes growth of foreign debts, conflict situations, and the slack pace of development. All that has political consequences. Now, the leaders of developing states, leaders of the Nonaligned Movement, clearly see the interrelation between the current state of the world and those urgent and most difficult tasks they have to solve, and that they can be solved confidently only in different circumstances. This very position of the developing states, which causes their increased political activity, shows that again that activity does not follow the course outlined in the current U.S. Administration's policy.

In this sort of situation, in such a state of affairs, I think that a negative Washington response to Soviet-U.S. dialogue would have simply been a political catastrophe, a very serious, tangible defeat.

[Zorin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, I would like to ask the following question: The United States and our country will take part in a bilateral meeting. We have spoken, and you have produced a large number of arguments showing the motives for which Washington considered it expedient to finally agree to that meeting. What are our motives?

[Arbatov] Well, you see, I am sure that our leadership had no illusions about the character of U.S. policy in general, and the current administration in particular, when the decision was taken.

[Arbatov continues] But first of all, the leaders of a country that knows what war is better than any other country, that lost over 20 million people in the last war, naturally cannot overlook even the slightest possibility. They cannot overlook even the slight possibility for securing peace and removing this new and even more terrible threat. This is simply a matter of responsibility for their own people and the entire world, esponsibility that is recognized by an ever growing number of people in other countries. I think that there are also other important reasons. One of these is that the time has come to determine once and for all the true intentions of this administration, to check it out fully, so to speak. You see, the administration was very frank at the beginning.

It said that all these agreements on arms limitations were bad, that it did not want to take them into consideration and did not want to hold any kind of talks with the Soviet Union. That applies to 1980, the 1981 election campaign, and part of 1982. The United States strives for military superiority over the Soviet Union. It wants to throw communism and socialism on the dust heap of history, and so forth. Later, after meeting with growing dissatisfaction and opposition to this policy both within the country and among allies and in the world in general, the position was changed. But the position was changed formally, outwardly, verbally. They stopped uttering words about their aim being superiority, about their aim being to make it possible to wage war and win. Instead, they began to say that it is not possible to wage a nuclear war or that it is not possible to win. They resumed talks with the Soviet Union and agreed to abide by the agreements signed earlier by the Soviet Union and the United States. It is clear that it is not possible to survive on rhetoric alone; talks go on, the arms race goes on, and there comes a moment when it finally becomes necessary to show clearly how the matter is progressing, what the administratin wishes, and what is is actually striving for.

This final moment has now come because of the logic of the technological development of means of destruction, new weapons sytems, because of political logic, and because of many other reasons.

'Checking out' Reagan

I also think that the moment of truth has also come at another level. I think that the critical time has come for checking out the U.S. leader, President Reagan. This may be his greatest checkup. What is he actually, the current leader of the largest and most powerful capitalist country? Is he a man completely divorced from reality, living in a world of some extremely reactionary dogmas, incorrect and sometimes falsified quotes that were handed to him and that he took without discrimination, and felt very comfortable in this shell all these years? Or is he a man who is getting some understanding of the realities of the current world, a man who is climbing out of that shell and rising to the responsibility required from him by his position and his political role? Of course, this is also a checkup of the President's entourage, his aides, although I do not believe in the theory that the king is good and it is all the fault of the ministers. The king himself selects his ministers. You see it is always safer to let the man live in a comfortable shell than to tell the 75-year-old man that he has lived for decades in a world of incorrect images of the surrounding political atmosphere, the world in general, military affairs, and even U.S. realities. And Nixon, in the article I mentioned, among many correct things said something that I think is very wrong: about Reagan actually not having to prove to Gorbachev in Geneva that he is standing for peace, that Gorbachev already knows that. I think this is incorrect. It is incorrect not only from Gorbachev's point of view, but from the entire world's point of view. Very many in the world are not sure whether Reagan stands for peace nor not.

[Arbatov continues] After all, you know they say that it is easy to love mankind in the abstract, and harder to love each man specifically; so it is very easy to say, in the abstract, that you support peace and universal well-being. But when it boils down to specific political steps, to restraing not only in words, but in deeds, when it boils down to terminating military programs and the conflict this entails internally between various representatives and influential groups in the ruling class, then this turns out differently. I think that Reagan still has much to prove. He has to prove his seriousness as a political figure, his responsibility, his ability to understand the world, and, of course, his peaceableness.

[Zorin] And Georgiy...

Reasons for Going to Geneva

[Shishlin interrupts] Valentin Sergeyevich, before you ask another question, I nevertheless would like to return to the initial question: What are we going to Geneva with? Why are we going to Geneva?

I think that the Americans and the present U.S. Administration can probably take into consideration not only what I have mentioned about military-strategic parity -- this is regardless of how this situation is assessed in the United States. But generally one thing is sure: They recognize the Soviet Union's ability to deal the United States unacceptable damage, at least equal to the U.S. ability.

I think we, in going to Geneva, have managed to show not only the United States that the socialist community, the socialist countries -- and this was probably most convincingly demonstrated at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee in Sofia -- are united, and all attempts to pursue a differentiated policy in relation to the socialist countries and to arouse some kind of discord between them have proved bankrupt.

It seems extremely important to me that, during the past year, we have begun to prove, and to prove well, that the Soviet Union can solve its internal problems more confidently and can focus, in the long term, on concentrating its efforts in solving constructive tasks, which is demonstrated in particular by the new draft edition of the CPSU Program that has been published.

Now, generally, I would not like to discourse on the topic of strong or weak positions, about who has the stronger or weaker position among the participants at the forthcoming Geneva meeting, but we can say one thing definitely, that the Soviet Union's position is not weak and is moral.

[Zorin] Now, when only a few days remain before the summit meeting, a very important circumstance, it appears to me, is becoming noticeable: extremely serious differences between this meeting's participants, besides differences on the most principled issues, not secondary ones.

In particular, the latest statements of the Washington Administration's leaders, as well as Reagan's speech at the jubilee session of the UN General Assembly attest to this. So, frankly speaking, the backdrop for the forthcoming meeting is not the best. Now, Georgiy Arkadyevich, how would you assess this situation on the eve of the meeting?

[Arbatov] This is a question which truly cannot fail to cause alarm. A startling thing has occured. Since the very moment this summer when agreement was reached on the summit meeting, the U.S. position on everything relating to Soviet-U.S. relations, to limiting the arms race, began to harden and to become even worse than previously.

Of course, this inevitably leads to very serious reflections, to doubts about the U.S. side's very intentions. Now, what in fact is a summit meeting? Without in any way belittling its significance, it is two working days. Taking into consideration what is said in the United States about the so-called attention span [spoken in English] -- in other words, that period during which the President can work, listen attentively, and understand his interlocutor -- it becomes fairly short, so it will be two short working days. Naturally, the summit meeting is not just these 2 days, it is everything occuring over a period of several months before it. Generally, you could even say that in some areas the summit meeting has already begun.

The Soviet peace initiatives can be understood in this way. With the nuclear test moratorium, we can see that, despite the categoric U.S. rejection, it received a response and it has now been repeated most convincingly and eloquently in the appeal of the leaders of the six states. The same goes for our other proposals, our new proposal on strategic arms limitation. I would even say that conceptual attitudes which I think have a significance no less important than concrete proposals, what Comrade Gorbachev spoke about in Paris, that in the nuclear age entirely different attidues are needed in relations between states and in international relations in general, that the role of force must be viewed in a completely different way, and so forth. All this is related to, and is a preparation for, the realization of this objective necessity, some decisive turnabout in the development of international relations.

[Arbatove continues] Unfortunately, we see something else from the U.S. side: an unequivocal no. When Nikolay Vladimirovich said that it had not given a final no to dialogue, again I would say that it is still early to say that, because it could say no at the meeting itself. This could be part of it, and we cannot be sure now whether it is positive.

Look at what is happening, if we take seriously Reagan's speech at the General Assembly. First of all, it amounts to a substitution of the agenda. It is an attempt to turn the meeting into something like a trial, in which the U.S. President, with his highly extremist and, I would say, archly conservative views, will act simultaneously as the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury.

But this will not work with us. It will not work with us. A game like this will not get anywhere with us and will fail at the summit meeting. It must be a serious political event. Only then will a serious success and serious results be possible. This is all that the Soviet Union has in mind, not any of these political games.

Then, of course, this souring of the atmosphere that is going on, an intentional souring to a great extent, literally on the eve of the meeting, cannot fail to arouse alarm. After all, this is something which sets up a lot of inertia. An atmosphere of anti-Soviet hysteria, created earlier, is intensified and aggravated, later weighing like lead shoes on the feet of every U.S. statesman. After all, if the Soviet Union is that bad, how can agreement be reached with it?

What about all the ultimatums they attempt to give us; in order to have peace you should do this, that, or the other. In other words, do everything to make the world an American one. This too will not work, with us or with others.

The world has become much larger, it is much bigger than America, and neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can rule it in their way. The world lives; and the majority of the world is, after all, not even the Soviet Union together with the United States.

[Shishlin] Nevertheless, Georgiy Arkadyevich, if we take a look at what American preparations for Geneva have amounted to, then despite all the extremism of the present U.S. Administration, it still seems to me that they are somehow digging in, they are attempting to secure those lousy positions which were so characteristic of the U.S. foreign policy course and activities.

In other words, if we now sift through what we have heard and seen over the past few months, then unfortunately very little remains. At least no elements of a new approach can be seen. Yet a new approach is simply a categoric demand in the nuclear age.

Now, you recall Mikhail Sergeyevich's address to the French parliamentarians. This idea of a new attitude, of an entirely new concept, if you will, in international relations was also seen in the document of the Political Consultative Committee conference; and generally this new concept includes several elementary truths of the nuclear age, although I must note that, for some reason, elementary truths are often learned with the greatest difficulty.

What elementary truths are we talking about? Primarily, of course, we are talking about a military solution to the problems of USSR-U.S. mutual relations or, in a broader context, to East-West mutual relations simply not existing. Further, in the nuclear age -- and I agree with you that in this case the interests of not only the Soviet Union and the United States are in question, but essentially those of the whole world -- security must be shared evenly. It must be universal, regardless of the size of one country or another.

[Arbatov] That it cannot be achieved at the expense of another party or against it.

[Shishlin] It is impossible, yes.

[Arbatov] We can die together or survive together, it is that kind of...

[Shishlin interrupts] That is why, if a solution is sought, we must reach out to, and not turn our backs on, one another.

Third, of course, interstate relations must be freed from ideological prejudice. Interatate relations in the nuclear age must be built on a common interest in -- I use that word again -- survival. Because of this, we must of course reach agreement, we must see, a reasonable compromise.

[Shishlin contiues] I think that all the American political baggage is not packed. It is even somewhat scattered, judging by what we know. Generally, this is of course in the order of things. One has to also take into account this routine diplomacy; it is unavoidable. However, the fact that the preparations in America for such a responsible and, also, such a rare meeting are for the time being conducted in a far-from-constructive tone, gives rise to watchfulness and concern.

Bush's Reaction to USSR Proposals

In this connection I would like to quote U.S. Vice President Bush. He said the following concerning Soviet ideas and initiatives in an interview with ASSOCIATED PRESS: The concrete proposals made by the Russians, although we have a few problems concerning these proposals, were steps in the right direction, says Bush. Up to now, a noticeable lack of specifics was observed; but now they have presented something and I would welcome this. ASSOCIATED PRESS assesses these quite loose words by the American Vice President thus: Bush's reaction to the Soviet proposals was one of the most positive within the administration up to now.

[Arbatov] How far to the right did one have to go to judge this a positive gesture?

[Shishlin, laughing] Yes.

[Arbatov] But there is something else here, because many Americans understand this and there's more to the world than America. They see the great activity of Soviet policy. They see the truly sincere desire, and not simply words. A certain number of intermediate-range missiles have been removed, tests have been halted, and a moratorium here and a moratorium there; and against this background, there is emphatically a challenge: No, we shall go the old way, we shall conduct another test, and we shall launch another military system, and so on. It has begun to get through to Americans and the administration that this puts them in quite a complicated position in this extremely concerned world, a concerned world with an oversaturation of weapons and the military threat hanging over it.

- -

[Zorin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, you have said that an atmosphere is being generated on the eve of the meeting which is unlikely to facilitate progress.

[Arabatov] You put it too mildly.

'Speculation on Human Rights'

[Zorin] In this connection, I would like to draw attention to the fact that speculation has again been intensifying precisely now, precisely in the last few days, about the problem of human rights. President Reagan engaged in this in his speech at the UN jubilee session. It is a remarkable circumstance that the U.S. Administration considers the problem of human rights as its political trump card.

I als happened to have returned quite recently from the United States. I spent quite a long time there, and I can say that not a day passed when I did not one way or another run into some manifestation of the most appalling human rights violations. I had the occasion to visit Chicago and talk to the leaders of the Mexican community there. Mexicans who live there and who are one of the most oppressed groups in the U.S. population, told me what the entire American press kept quiet: the murder of (Rudi Lozano). (Rudi Lozano) is called the Mexican Martin Luther King. He organized the Mexican movement for the defense of their rights, and was killed on the doorstep of his house. I visited his home and talked with his widow and with leaders of the Mexican community. They say that the official version of a lone murderer is nonsense. It was a conspiracy, it was a smoothed-over scenario in a country where human rights are guarded so much.

You recall that John Kennedy was killed by a lone person; there was no conspiracy. Robert Kennedy was killed by a lone person, there was no conspiracy. Martin Luther King was also killed by a lone person. Now (Rudi Lozano) is also killed by a lone person. The threads of conspiracy are being concealed as deeply as possible, and everyone is silent. In these conditions, the U.S. leaders consider it possible to play the political card, with human rights the trump card. Well, I think that this is possible only in the case...

[Arabatov interrupts] Tell me, Valentin Sergeyvich, don't you think that, specifically, perhaps the people surrounding Reagan understand human rights very singularly: as the rights of the rich to live with their wealth, to completely ignore all others, and do what they want in the world.

[Zorin] Absolutely. But this is their interpretation of the rights...

[Arabatov interrupts] Yes, and they want to impose it on (?the whole world).

[Zorin] But to come out at serious international forums and meetings with such an interpretation of human rights! If we talk seriously, it would be better for them to hold their tongues on this subject, on the principle that people in glass houses shouldn't throw stones.

[Shishlin] You know, Valentin Sergeyevich, there is an episode, an anecdote from American everyday political life. A cricket was very scared that he would be stepped on and therefore turned to a wise owl with a request about how he could excape this threat. The owl said: Turn into an eagle. The cricket asked a second questions: How do I turn into a eagle? The owl replied: I do not study questions of logistic support, I study planning. I think that is how the American strategists plan the human rights campaign. Generally, it is not a double-edged swords. No.

[Zorin] But a single-edged sword, cutting the Americans.

[Shishlin] Yes.

[Zorin] I think that within the framework of today's discussion it will be interesting to hear a reply to the question about world reaction to the coming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?

[Shishlin] The question appears to be simple, yet at the same time it is not all that simple. A general assessment of the situation shows that the majority of states welcome the meeting, unconditionally placing great hopes on it. Some common interests of countries and peoples are expressed here. But the reaction itself to the meeting is diverse and different.

'Class Solidary' in NATO

Georgiy Arkadyevich has already mentioned the sessions being held within the NATO framework. Specifically, you can also mention the meeting of the capitalist six within the framework of the 40th UN anniversary. Here you can say plainly that class solidarity remains; and with all the existing differences with its partners, the United States is managing to hold the general front of capitalist states. Nevertheless, in the main and on the whole I think we are justified in saying that U.S. allies, including fairly close one, stand for an agreement with the Soviet Union; they come out extremely cautiously concerning "star wars" plans. Moreover, they exercise specific pressure on Washington to submit its constructive counterproposals to the extensive Soviet initiatives, which are assessed as the cornerstone and clearly defined issues which can be discussed at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

We have already mentioned developing countries. I think that here the main phenomenon is not the sympathy and support by the Nonaligned Movement as the declared position of the Soviet Union, insofar as this position is really dictated by our own interests and those of international security. I do not think that it is possible to talk about this as much as about...

[Arbatov interrupts] ...interests of development...

[Shishlin] ...interests of development, yes; and the amount of growth of political activity and political weight of this group of states in this aspect. I think it is risky for Washington to ignore this group of states. Naturally, I need hardly say that we are supported by socialist countries, and this support is expressed in various very interesting ideas, in active political steps, political actons. Talking about the essence of the matter, we can can say that the wide international background is favorable for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

PRC Reaction to Summit

[Zorin] I would like to return to the question of world reaction to the coming meeting and, view of the fact that you have just returned from a trip to the PRC, I would to ask you, Georgiy Arkadyevich, to speak about PRC reaction to the forthcoming meeting.

[Arbatov] You know that I held many discussions. Most of the time, I had to deal with Chinese foreign affairs specialists and scientists, and naturally this issue constantly received special attention. I would say, actually, it is from official documents and not only from conversations, that the position of the PRC has undergone very substantial changes with respect to Soviet-U.S. relations. China has completely departed from that inherently colorful Chinese and mythical image of sitting on the mountain and watching two tigers fighting. They in China understand well that no one will be able to sit out a world nuclear war, a nuclear war between the USSR and the United States.

China is interested in preventing such a war like any other country. I am convinced there has been a serious improvement in China, in the understanding that international tension and the arms race cause great harm to China's interests. The Americans began it [the arms race] not only in Europe, but in the Pacific as well, they are intensifying it in the Pacific. This leads to the militarization of Japan, creates the threat of the militarization of Japan. The Soviet Union is naturally forced to reply with measures for strengthening its defenses. This leads to the situation in which China is faced with a very difficult choice. In the conditions of the arms race being intensified by the United States, it has either to slip down to the position of a third-rate military power or join the race and do away with all its plans for overcoming centruies-old backwardness in the country, and modernization, which is now being given primary importance.

[Shishlin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, what you have said about China is very interesting. I will interrupt you for just a moment because, as far as the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is concerned, an interview with Deng Xiaoping, one of the Chinese leaders, appeared a few days ago in TIME magazine, in which he directly comments on the views of the Chinese leadership on the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

I think these words speak about China's attitude. Deng Xiaoping says: We welcome the summit meeting. It is better to meet with one another than not to meet at all. But we do not attach any particular hopes to it. It is hard to judge the Soviet proposal to reduce the number of their missiles by 50 percent. It appears to be a fairly good proposal. Nevertheless, we shall not judge -- and it is not easy to judge -- whether the two sides will be able to reach agreement on this proposal.

[Arbatov] Yes. Well, as a matter of fact, doubts about the meeting also exist in China -- what is how I would put it -- in China, too, about the outcome.

'Sino-Soviet Relations'

[Zorin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, I would like to take this opportunity to digress a little from the main theme of our discussion and ask you to share a few more of your impressions, even if most briefly, about your trip.

[Arbatov] You know, it would be presumptious of me to think that I could become a specialist on China as a result of a 2-week visit. Of course, there are many impressions. But I think the most important, from a political aspect, surprised me. Well, first of all, despite the fact that I read about this naturally and followed these things as best I could, I could not imagine the depth of the trauma -- economic, political revolution, its frightful consequences, and the trouble with which China and the Chinese people are getting out of these difficulties.

Second, I saw a very great interest in the Soviet Union and, at least among scientists and social scientists, a great degree of knowledge about the questions being discussed in our country and the new things that are occurring. There was a very great interest in all this. I would also like to say that, although I had very little time to see things in China, although it is a very interesting country withan ancient civilization and culture, I did visit the Great Wall of China near Beijing.

Looking at this grandiose structure, which is several thousand kilometers long and very wide -- a car can drive along the wall -- high, and massive with many towers, I thought of that eternal illusion. Once upon a time, the Chinese emperors probably spent hundreds of millions of man-hours on its creation...

[Shishlin interrupts] probably billions.

[Arbatov] Yes, about that great illusion that security can be achieved with the help of some technical trick or technical means.

They built the wall. Nevertheless, the Mongols, Manchurians, and others conquered them. I thought about how tenacious this illusion is. There was also the Maginot line, and now we have "star wars."

Hopes for Geneva

[Zorin] We have returned to the topic of today's discussion, and, in conclusion, I would like to ask you the following question: How do you imagine now, at the beginning of November this year, a general assessment of the international situation?

[Shishlin] Well, we have spoken about this already, and I understand, Valentin Sergyevich, by the deliberate and precise way you put the question that a general assessment of the international situation is by no means the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Unfortunately, one must precisely declare that preparations for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting have been different in Washington and Moscow, and the method of preparations was different.

At the same time, both a need for an agreement and the possibility for an agreement exist, and the need is most imperious. The aim and cost of this meeting is very high, and of course the Soviet Union strives to get maximum results from Geneva. Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States, separately or together, are capable of solving all international problems, and this task is not being addressed. However, Geneva could create the prerequisites for a turn to the better.

I think that as a result of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva -- Georgiy Arkadyevich may correct me -- the world will not get worse. But whether or not it will get better remains for the Geneva meeting to answer.

[Arbatov] Well, you know, I think that of course we must also fear disappointment; and insofar as there are many expectations, it would be much better and safer if these expectations were not followed by disappointment. Politically, this is very undesirable. But overall I would say that despite all this we should not lose the feeling of reality in all its diversity and the understanding of several truths.

One truth is that the history of Soviet-U.S. relations did not begin with the Reagan administration and most likely will not end with it. The second one is that there is more to the world than America, and we cannot and do not look at the world through a prism of Soviet-U.S. relations. They are very important and we attach enormous significance to them, but we know that there is much more to the world. There are things to do in the world; many processes, including very positive ones, are occurring, and I would say that, overall, both our international situation and generally, I think, the prestige of the Soviet Union are higher than in many years.

This instills confidence and optimism if we look at things from the point of view of big world strategy and the world situation.

[Zorin] Our time on the air has run out. It remains for me to think you, my colleagues, for participating in our talk today, and to thank our television viewers for their attention. So, until our next meeting here in our Studio 9, thank you.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD031727 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 3 Nov 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, political observer for Central Television and All-Union Radio with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD; and Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, deputy editor in chief of MIROVAYA ECONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA (World Economy and International Relations)]

Reaction to CPSU Program

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, comrades! Reports are continuing to come in from many countries which show the very broadest international response to the publication of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program. Here are some of the most typical, in my view, statements. The Polish TRYBUNA LUDU writes: What we have here is a document of truly fundamental importance for the international communist and workers' movement and for the situation throughout the world. The Hungarian NEPSZAVA points out that formalism and idle talk are alien to the draft new edition of the program, and that the document substantiates in concrete terms the possibility of the accelerated social and economic development of the Soviet Union. Finally THE WASHINGTON POST writes: The new edition of the program is viewed by local observers not so much as a list of achievements, but rather as a guiding map for the future. In the analysis of today's age which is given in the new edition of the program, it is noted that socialism has become a world system: A socialist community exists, and this is a completely new type of international relations -- truly, relations between peoples.

[Lebedev] Incidentally, the latest meeting in Sofia of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee demonstrated this very vividly. And here I think it is appropriate to recall what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in Sofia during his visit to Bulgaria, that the voice of the Soviet Union at the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Geneva will also be the voice of all the countries of the socialist community. At the meeting in Sofia our latest new initiatives were given unanimous support. The socialist community, as the draft new edition of the program points out, has generally become the most authoritative force today, without which one can say that not a single major question in world politics can be solved; and it is this which is perhaps the most graphic confirmation of the fundamental change in the correlation of forces that has taken place on the world scene in favor of the peoples struggling for social progress, democracy, national freedom, and peace.

[Kolchanov] Were it not for the Soviet Union and the powerful socialist community, the world could not have lived in peace for the past 40 years. Indisputably, that is thanks, first and foremost, to the great socialist community.

Socialist 'Cohesion'

[Zholkver] It was noted at the regular meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo that one of the most important results of the Sofia meeting -- and you were just speaking, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee -- was the further strengthening of the unity and cohesion of the allied socialist states, the perfection of the mechanism of their cooperation within the framework of the Warsaw Pact, and the inexorable resolve by the fraternal countries to further continue their staunch struggle for the peaceful future of our planet. Last week, too, there were numerous examples of such cooperation.

A protocol was signed in Moscow on the results of the coordination of the state plans of the Soviet Union and the GDR in 1986-1990 and for a longer period. In the forthcoming 5-year plan period, trade turnover will grow by almost one third and will exceed R82 billion. But it is not only a matter of this increase in volume: A number of concrete measures will also be taken in the sphere of production specialization and joint production aimed at intensifying production, accelerating scientific and technological progress, and making wide use of the latest scientific and technological achievements. This, of course, is true not only for the Soviet Union and the GDR: In a similar way the Soviet Union coordinates its plans with other socialist countries, too.

[Lebedev] And an agreement has just been signed in Budapest, too, up to the year 2000.

[Kolchanov] And, of course, if we return to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Bulgaria. I think it must definitely be stresed that the all-round economic cooperation itself between the socialist countries is moving in an ascending line, from the simpler forms to the more complex ones, to long-term, special-target programs: machine building, the introduction of the latest equipment, scientific and technological progress, plus the Food Program. Overall it is a matter primarily of the solution of the most cardinal questions of the world economy — if you like, the most cardinal questions without which the development of one country or another, and the whole of our community, is impossible. It is a joint discussion of all parties with an interest, a joint quest for the optimum solutions.

[Zholkver] Yes, and a quest for new forms of cooperation, too. During that same visit to Bulgaria that you were speaking of, an agreement was signed for the setting up of joint scientific production associations and combines where both Soviet and Bulgarian scientists and production people, in precisely those leading spheres such as machine-building, as you said, will be engaged in a joint scientific quest and, what is particularly important, in putting those scientific findings directly into production.

[Kolchanov] And, as a representative of a workers' newspaper, I, of course, must stress that there is taking place a very rapid process of communal work between working collectives, labor collectives, and individual enterprises, and that is important both economically and politically for the success of all of our socialist community and for the strengthening of the friendship between all our peoples.

[Zholkver] I think this successful development of cooperation between the socialist countries in many areas is perhaps doubly noteworthy against the background of the continued worsening of the general crisis of capitalism, which is examined in such a well-grounded way in the draft new edition of the Party Program. Here, too, there are more than enough examples from the past few days. There are, for example, the figures just published by the Common Market which show that the number of unemployed there is approaching 13 million.

[Kolchanov] And furthermore, those are greatly underreported official figures you have there, Aleksandr Vladimirovich. If you were to take the trade union data, the figure would be at least 50 percent higher, and they are indeed closer to the truth.

U.S. Unemployment

[Zholkver] Yes, I was just about to do as you suggest, Rudolf Georgiyevich, and use the trade union data on unemployment in the United States, that richest of all countries in the capitalist world.

As you know, the U.S. trade union association, AFL-CIO, has held its congress in Los Angeles, where it was stressed that, as before, the most acute problem -- incidentally, this is a human rights problem -- is that of unemployment in the United States. Here again it is just as you pointed out: Official data give the U.S. unemployment level as 7 percent, whereas according to data presented at the congress at least 12 percent are without work. AFL-CIO President Kirkland stated the following: The genuine reality of the United States does not in the least correspond to the optimistic picture of an American dawn portrayed by President Reagan. The so-called economic revival observed in number of corporations remains a myth for the 8 million Americans who are unable to find a job. The country's army of superfluous people is now even more numerous than during the 1971 industrial crisis. As for the young generation, Kirkland continues, they do not count on living better than their parents; their opportunities are collapsing, and together with them, their hopes. Forgive me for quoting so extensively, but I find it interesting that Kirkland should make such a statement.

[Lebedev] Yes, a man with a reputation for being far from sympathetic to our country and to the socialist community as a whole.

[Zholkver] An extreme right-wing figure of anticommunist persuasions, but nonetheless this type of analysis and, it must be said, quite bitter admission of the acuteness of U.S. social problems seems to me very significant.

[Lebedev] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, you have been talking about the United States and we, quite naturally, very often focus our attention on data on the United States; and in the new draft program the United States is spoken of as, of course, the citadel of imperialism where all these social diseases and problems are to be seen perhaps most clearly. However, if we look at Japan, a country which until recently -- Rudolf Georgiyevich will no doubt confirm this -- was considered to be more successful, particularly with regard to the rise in unemployment. It too, according to the latest figures, now has almost 1.6 million officially registered unemployed. This figure is 100,000 higher than last year, again using official data.

So, of course, this all vividly confirms once again the correctness of the conclusion given in the new draft concerning the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. And this is shown in the gulf between the interests of a group of the largest monopolies and multinational corporations and the overwhelming majority of working people, of the population as a whole. Naturally, manifestations of the general crisis take various forms. These include the phenomenon of the militarization of social consciousness, which we are all observing through the foreign press and which is especially evident in the United States. But that is not all. There is the revival of neofascist trends and the activation of neofascist circles in a number of countries.

[Kolchanov] And the most harsh attacks on the most primary human rights, of which we can also see very vivid instances.

U.S. Military Expenditures

[Kholkver] But to stay on the subject of economics, which is primary and preeminent, one cannot fail to note that they see the way out of these crisis phenomena through the expansion and continuation of the arms race. This is because, as the new draft program stresses, the arms race has always guaranteed the greatest profits to the monopolies.

It is no coincidence that at this very time the U.S. House of Representatives is approving unprecedented military expenditures for the future fiscal year -- let me remind you that the U.S. fiscal year begins in October -- and allocating to the Pentagon $302.5 billion, or $10 billion more than for the fiscal year ending on 1 October.

[Lebedev] And over 5 years that figure will probably soon almost have doubled, taking, that is, the end of the seventies and the beginning of the eighties.

[Kolchanov] When talking about the arms race in the United States, whatever subject we are discussing -- SDI or chemical weapons -- it is a question of tens of billions. The so-called chemical rearmament program is costing $10 billion according to one set of data and $12 billion according to new figures now out. Nobody can say how much it will really cost.

Economics of SDI

[Zholkver] You mentioned SDI, the so-called Strategic Defensive Initiative, or "star wars" program, about which THE WASHINGTON POST writes: The U.S. military industry considers "star wars" the most promising source of profit of all time. This is the reason for the persistent efforts to push through and further pursue the "star wars" program, despite the demands of the entire public, including the American public itself, precisely because it promises the monopolies such truly record profits. Incidentally, it is not just American monopolies.

[Kolchanov] Here I would like to stress a factor which I feel is important: One cannot reduce the arms race and militarization of the country to mere chasing after profits. There is an even more dangerous aspect to it as well. While creating weapons and arming themselves more and more, certain circles are envisaging opportunities for external expansion. Weapons are being manufactured not only to earn billions of dollars but they are being stockpiled for an unspecified day, occasion, or year when they will eventually be put to use. This is a most dangerous aspect of the arms race and one which, of course, we must not forget.

As far as the economic aspect of the matter is concerned, there is one thing I would like to stress, and that is conversion and reconversion, the expenditure of money for military needs and civilians needs and so forth. There is a quite persistent belief in the West that ever-new weapons production capacities create more and more new jobs. To be sure, it cannot be said that they do not create new jobs. When a new munitions factory for manufacturing missiles is built, jobs are created there. But if the money spent on the construction of this missile factory or another factory producing weapons of mass destruction was spent on peaceful purposes, on construction projects, on the service sector or what have you, one could create two, three, and sometimes even five times more jobs than by means of these munitions factories. There are a large number of studies on this which have been conducted by trade unions in the West -- America, Britain, West Germany, and France. They show convincingly that every dollar, mark, pound, and lira used for peaceful construction in the civilian branches of industry, creates the largest number of jobs, not the money thrown away on military production.

Reagan's UN Speech

[Lebedev] Yes. I would like to add a few words to that. Reality, literally every day -- and the events of the past week are no exception -- convinces one of the correctness of the conclusion and analysis contained in the draft new version of the program to the effect that the principal source of the present exacerbation of international tension and the principal threat to humanity of being destroyed in a nuclear cataclysm derives from imperialism, and most of all the United States.

The anniversary session of the UN General Assembly has just taken place in New York. It marked the 40th anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations. How much was expected from President Reagan's speech and what is the reaction now! There reigns in general quite a profound disaffection and dissatisfaction even in the upper echelons.

So to speak, the ruling circles of the NATO countries and the U.S. close allies, and it is characteristic that even THE NEW YORK TIMES said in one of its editorials that the President, from whom humanity expected to hear proposals for peaceful progress, the President offered a bellicose homily. Other organs of the press and political circles are responding in roughly the same vein. They are saying that in response to the constructive proposals advanced by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Paris, which received backing at the Sofia session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, in response to this attempts are manifestly being made, first to belittle the significance of these initiatives and, secondly, to deflect attention from these specific proposals by all available means. They are beginning to talk along the lines that the Soviet Union has proposed that the nuclear strategic armaments which can reach each other's territory be reduced by half -- and incidentally just a month ago these same people were saying that the Soviet Union would never make radical proposals on reducing nuclear armaments, let alone strategic weapons -- this, they are now saying, is not all that significant: Peace now does not depend on this; what you must do, you see, is discuss regional conflict situations in trouble-spots, and the selection of trouble-spots for discussion...

[(?Zholkver) interrupts] Yes, the selection of trouble-spots and the selection of regions is very symptomatic.

[Lebedev] This selection is indeed very symptomatic, because they are all trouble-spots where, it seems to the United States, that it can go on the offensive, although this is not at all the case. But the main thing is not so much the areas they selected, but the areas they did not mention and which they deliberately left out. The Near East does not figure there, Nicaragua, Central America, and El Salvador do not figure; southern Africa does not figure. And Chile is absent too, of course. Clearly all this is being done because, as another American newspaper said, the main task now is to attempt to outflank the Soviet Union in the propaganda sphere.

[Zholkver] But this is eliciting increasing protests even among the closest U.S. allies, something which emerged at the just-ended session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group. On the one hand, of course, there was the same arm-twisting on the part of Weinberger and demands for the continuation of the build up of nuclear armaments and for the continuation of the build-up of nuclear armaments and for more active support for American military space programs; but at the same time -- and this was noted by the entire Western press -- there occurred what THE NEW YORK TIMES called a revolt by the NATO allies who declared that the tackling of disarmament problems must not be put off to the Greek calends, and that this is now the most important problems, and that this problem must be paramount at the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in Geneva.

Antiwar Movement

Well, that is the view of government circles; but as far as the view of the broad public, the mass democratic movements which are also mentioned in the draft new edition of the Party Program, is concerned, last week we witnessed perhaps the highest pitch of the antiwar movement. I am talking about the Week of Action for Disarmament which swept the whole world. These were actions, on the one hand, on the UN initiative, and at the same time they were actively supported by the World Peace Council and national peace movements. I have never seen such demonstrations, in London, for instance. In the Hague last week there was a colossal demonstration.

There is a real threat of the deployment of American missiles in the Netherlands. It seems to me that all these facts confirm again that the Party Program's clause dealing with the exceptional importance of the role of anti-imperialist and antiwar movements in the modern age is profoundly substantiated.

[Lebedev] To add something to what you have just been saying, Aleksandr Vladimirovich: It is very noteworthy that several weeks ago the relevant organs of the Western press were predicting that an upsurge in anitwar demonstrations would not take place this autumn. To what you said I can add that in fact -- you mentioned the Netherlands -- 4 million Dutch people have signed a petition to the government and to parliament demanding that they should renounce the siting of the new American missiles.

[Zholkver] Although the government is trying to ignore this.

[Lebedev] It is ignoring this and is proving -- or rather is trying to maintain -- that the decision on the siting of the missiles is allegedly in line with the mood of the majority of Dutch and is in their interests. But this 4 million makes up the majority of the adult population in the Netherlands. This figure is clear enough. Almost 2 million French people have also put their signatures on document of the Appel des Cert, and antiwar organization in France. They are demanding that the arms race on earth be halted and its extension to space be averted. And over a million people in Japan have also taken part in demonstrations over the last week. More than 200,000 people in Finland, with its small population, took part in such demonstrations. In Denmark a million working people took part in a peace strike, and so on.

[Kolchanov] In connection with the public peace movements I would like to make three remarks. First: you remember just a few years ago Western propagandists ascribed the antiwar movement, at least in Western Europe, to Moscow, the hand of Moscow, saying it was inspired by Moscow and so on. Now they are keeping quiet about this. And this is very remarkable, because who will raise his voice today and allege that these facts about which you, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, and you, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, have just been talking are the inspiration of Moscow? Who can say this? This pseudoargument has faded and it does not exist. The second thing I want to point out is that 2 years ago it was persistently claimed in the West that the role and scale of the public peace movement were falling. The forecasts have in no way been borne out. The breadth of the movement refutes this talk.

[(?Zholkver)] In terms of mass following and political breadth.

[Kolchanov] Yes. Third, I just want to say something about the political spectrum, so to speak, of this movement. If previously there were predominantly people of a left-wing persuasion, now in the ranks of the peace movement one comes across all sorts of people. There are Communists and nonparty members, believers and non-believers, and representatives of conservative circles and many regional organizations. What is interesting is that regional organizations are being created, organizations based on professions -- doctors, chemists for peace, Christians for peace, and so on.

[Zholkver] Finally, the fact that the physicians' movement in defense of peace has received the Nobel Peace Prize. This is a sign of the times.

[Kolchanov] So, it is quite correct that in the draft new edition of the Third Party Program, public movements are called one of the most important integral parts of the forces determining the world's development today.

Visit by Ethiopia's Mengistu

[Zholkver] And such a mighty force is of course the antiimperialist struggle of countries who have thrown off the yoke of colonialism. Just in the last few days we have witnessed the really very deep changes which Comrade Mengistu Haile Mariam, the leader of Socialist Ethiopia, talked about during a friendly working visit to Moscow. Of course, the difficulties the country is going through are great, and he talked about a program which has now been passed to overcome the consequences of drought and measures to give a lift to the country's economy. But these are indeed historic changes which we are witnessing in the example of Socialist Ethiopia, which is connected with us, by the way, through the linkes of a treaty on friendship and cooperation, something which was again confirmed during the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Mengistu Haile Mariam. Here a high value was placed on the contribution by Socialist Ethiopia to the total efforts to maintain world peace and security. In particular, Ethiopia is championing the idea of the creation in Africa of a nuclear-weapons-free zone. I think that such kinds of specific demonstrations of the close interrelationship of our country with countries that have thrown of the colonialist yoke, struggling in difficult conditions to strengthen their national independence, for their progressive development, are also a sign of our times, and this is also stressed in the draft new edition of the Party Program.

[Kolchanov] The Soviet Union and the socialist system of course have a clear effect on national liberation movements through their example, through their existence, and their successes. But there is no export of revolution here, as is said from time to time in the West.

[Lebedev] All this taken together provides a basis for the conclusion which is given in the draft, Aleksandr Vladimirovich: namely, that there is no fatal inevitability of a world war. And this fatal inevitability does not exist precisely because the aggressive policies of imperialism are countered by the growing potential of the forces of peace.

[Zholkver] It seems to me that in summing up our discussion I would no doubt conclude with the clause which also concludes the draft new edition of the Party Program. It stresses the sense of historical optimism which is characteristic of communists, their faith in the future. Yes, we believe that a switch to genuine security and cooperation, a return to detente and its extension to all spheres of peace -- and we have repeatedly noted this in our discussion today -- are capable of averting a nuclear catastrophe and guaranteeing the supreme right of the peoples, the right to a peaceful life and free development.

Thank you, comrades, for taking part in this discussion. Thank you, listeners, for your attention. All the best to you.

SOVIET-U.S. GROUP DISCUSSES CENTRAL AMERICA

LD022141 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] On 31 October and 1 November a Soviet-American exchange of views at the level of experts on the question of the situation in Central America took place in Washington. It was shown in a well-argued way by the Soviet side that the dangerous international tension existing in this region is the result of the wrongful U.S. actions vis-a-vis Nicaragua and other Central American countries.

SHULTZ TRAVELS TO MOSCOW FOR PRE-SUMMIT TALKS

Moscow Arrival

LD040932 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz arrived in Moscow today for a business visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government. He arrived together with McFarlane, assistant othe U.S. President for national security affairs. At the airport the U.S. secretary of state was met by Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; Comrade Komplektov, deputy USSR foreign minister; Comrade Dobrynin, USSR ambassador to the United States; and other officials. Among the welcoming party was Hartman, the U.S. Ambassador to the USSR.

Meets Shevardnadze

LD040939 Moscow TASS in English 0928 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 4 TASS -- Soviet-U.S. talks opened in Moscow today. The talks are conducted by Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and George Shultz, secretary of state of the United States.

The U.S. secretary of state arrived in Moscow today on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

IZVESTIYA PUBLISHES REAGAN INTERVIEW, COMMENTS

LD041409 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 4 TASS -- The newspaper IZVESTIYA today carries Ronald Reagan's interview in which the U.S. President sets forth his position on problems of Soviet-U.S. relations and a number of international issues.

The President among other things touched upon the forthcoming summit meeting in Geneva. Alongside general pronouncements in favor of peace and normalized relations with the Soviet Union, attempts were made in the interview to distort the Soviet foreign policy. The policy with respect to so-called regional problems was presented in the same light. Evading answers to questions concerning Washington's course with regard to Nicaragua, southern Africa and the Middle East, the President tried to create the impression that tension in the world is a consequence of the Soviet policy in different regions.

At the same time IZVESTIYA carries an article by four Soviet journalists, Gennadiy Shishkin, Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, Stanislav Kondrashev and Genrikh Borovik, who interviewed the President. They write about their impressions from the talk with the President and express their views on the questions which he touched upon during the meeting, including on key aspects of the present international situation and the Soviet-U.S. relations.

The interview of the U.S. President, they write, turned out to be contradictory. The good words about peace, about the striving towards accord with the Soviet Union went side by side with the unfounded accusations with regard to our country's foreign policy. However, the very fact of the recognition of the need for extensive Soviet-American dialogue is a positive sign. One would like to believe that the U S S R 's readiness to achieve a drastic turn for the better in Soviet-American relations will encounter in Geneva a constructive response from the American side.

REAGAN COMMENT IN BBC INTERVIEW 'FREUDIAN SLIP'

LD021019 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] During an interview with the BBC on Tuesday, President Reagan pointed out the absence of a word for freedom in the Russian language. Later the White House admitted the President had been wrong. Vladimir Posner comments: The President was quite right when he informed both his BBC interviewer and the audience that he was, I quote, no linguist. Nobody should hold that against him. He is, however, the President of the United States of America, and his confusing of two totally independent elements speaks worlds for his outlook, more in fact than the actual interview. Strangely enough no one seems to have noticed this, so bear with me.

The BBC correspondent was asking the President to discuss the major differences between the United States and the USSR. The answer was, I quote, oh my heavens, there are two systems so diametrically opposed that, I'm no linguist, but I've been told that in the Russian language there isn't even a word for freedom. Without really noticing it, President Reagan thus equated the Russian language with the Soviet system, and both with the supposed absence of a word for freedom in the Russian language. Think about it for just a minute. We all know the age of the Soviet system, it was born on 7 November 1917 and will soon celebrate its 68th anniversary. As for the Russian language, even though I too am not a linguist, I know that it, like English, is many centuries old. So, if there is no word for freedom in the Russian language then one must conclude that its absence relates to and reflects on Russian mentality -- a conclusion as wrong as it is dangerous.

It is one thing to have different systems and yet to share common human ideas which make it possible to talk and reach understanding. It is quite another matter to be separated by differences so profound as to rule out human common ground and basically understanding. I'm sure that had the BBC correspondent called Ronald Reagan's attention to the pernicious logic of the Russian equals system equation, the President would have been quick to see its flaw. But it is precisely this Freudian slip of the tongue that I find so disturbing. What it indicates is that after years of dehumanizing us, demonizing this country and its people, the demonizers have become the victims of their own prejudice.

The concept of freedom is basic to human thought. Language is the basic mirror of a people's psyche. So, to accept the existence of a language without a word for freedom is to accept the existence of a people who are not really human -- some kind of inferior people -- which reminds me, as it should you, of something I've heard before. Oh yes, just for the record and enlightenment's sake, the Russian word for freedom is svoboda. There is also another word, Volya, but I guess I shouldn't expect the President's advisers to remember that -- there's a limit to what can be expected.

REAGAN PREPARATION FOR SUMMIT CRITICIZED

LD032146 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Nov 85

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpt] The draft CPSU Program once again confirms that the new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union are not a tactical step dictated by temporary considerations. It is a reflection of the strategic line of our party which sees the historic vocation of socialism as being the protection of mankind from nuclear catastrophe. It is from this position that we also regard the coming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting set for just over 2 weeks time.

It cannot be said Washington does not have a serious attitude to this event. Judging by the U.S. President's timetable for the next few days, his attention will be concentrated on preparations for Geneva. As reports note, he is to study in particular 25 special memorandums on various aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations and on life in the Soviet Union; talk to Sovietology experts and also congressmen and senators who have met Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev; and exchange opinions with three former U.S. Presidents, Nixon, Ford, and Carter, who have experience in talks with our leaders. Reagan even intends watching a special film about Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, made for the head of the White House by U.S. Government departments. Finally, it is expected that a dress rehearsal of the summit meeting will be held when Reagan will be faced by a leading Sovietologist of the U.S. Administration -- apparently, Matlock, special assistant to the President for national security affairs.

This is more like preparation for a debate between rivals on the eve of U.S. presidential elections than for talks by leaders of two great powers. Of course, the fact that the U.S. President will gain an opportunity to somehow expand his not-too-great knowledge of our country should be welcomed. But, one cannot avoid a feeling -- as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has noted -- that the U.S. side is preparing for the Geneva meeting as for a fight by political super-gladiators of some kind; thinking only about how to deftly hurt an opponent and how to score an extra point. The solving of vital problems, on which the future of mankind depends, is pushed into the background. However, people throughout the world expect the coming meeting to decide on concrete measures aimed at halting the arms race.

BOLSKAHOV EXAMINES PRE-SUMMIT ISSUES, ACTIVITIES

PM021837 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Bolshakov "International Review"]

[Text] Program of Peace and Creation

In the West the inertia of entrenched thinking is strong. People there "complain" that the Soviet Union has mounted an unprecedented "propaganda offensive," and with its initiatives in foreign, and even domestic policy "it is putting the West at a disadvantage."

Old and threadbare is the method whereby any proposals emanating from the USSR are declared to be "propaganda." Equally discreditable is the approach to relations with the world of real socialism on this same foundation. It is time for the West to open its eyes to what is happening, to free itself from the customary blinders and anti-communist myths. The reality is as follows: The Soviet Union is now carrying out an enormous amount of work to accelerate the country's socioeconomic development. Accordingly it is seeking also to create favorable international conditions, and to preserve and consolidate peace. Herein too lies the prime cause of the submission of our new peace initiatives and not in the desire to impress the world or to throw dust in the eyes of the public abroad.

Speaking in Sofia, M.S. Gorbachev said: "We are proposing very simple and clear things: halving the respective nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States; firmly closing the door to the deployment of weapons in space; and halting and reversing the buildup of nuclear missiles in Europe."

Any soberminded person will be persuaded of the Soviet Union's peaceful intentions by the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program published 26 October and now under discussion by all Soviet people, Communists and nonparty people -- a draft for social progress and peace.

At the very time when, say, there are now in the United States some 3 million homeless people and over 30 million people living below the poverty line, and the real number of unemployed exceeds 14 million, capitalism is assuming the mantle of yesterday's society. But this is no fault of ours!

Britain's FINANCIAL TIMES states that, as is indicated by the draft new edition of the Party Program, in the USSR "by the year 2000 practically every Soviet family will have its own house or apartment, the output of consumer goods will have doubled, and labor productivity will have more than doubled."

This is a realistic program based on, as is being remarked in the West and East, a profound analysis of reality in which there is neither the desire to "outstrip history" nor the slightest wish to be dragged along in its wake. "In its latest edition, the CPSU Program," states a report carried in RENMIN RIBAO, "is a program for the systematic and comprehensive improvement of socialism and for Soviet society's further advance toward communism on the basis of the country's accelerated socioeconomic development."

The CPSU's call for peaceful coexistence and detente with all countries of the West, for normal, stable relations between the USSR and the United States, and for the further development of peaceful good-neighborliness and cooperation among the states of Europe and of other continents combine harmoniously with the USSR's new, specific initiatives, which have been endorsed by its Warsaw Pact allies.

But Was I a "Sensation"?

Until literally the last moment the White House was refuting all rumors that somewhere within its depths a response to the Soviet proposals had already been formulated. Then suddenly a "sensation" occurred. On 31 October the President announced at a press conference that a response was ready and had been sent to Geneva to the participants in the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms. What do the U.S. counterproposals consist of? As yet one can only guess, since the President announced that he intends to keep the specific numbers secret. He singled out four points in his proposals. In his words, they "are aimed at deep cuts in the nuclear arsenals of the two powers; the elimination of the first-strike advantage; a proposal for defense research; and prohibiting deceit." The President added that his counterproposals take into account the Soviet proposals, although he does not consider the latter to be "inadequate."

In an interview he gave for the BBC 29 October the President asserted that tests [ispytaniya] of space weapons are "permitted" under the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems. Obviously it was on this premise that point three of his counterproposals was formulated. The very same was confirmed 31 October by Pentagon chief Weinberger, who stated that the United States "is ready to negotiate with Moscow on any military system" with the exception of "star wars."

The news agencies are reporting that the "new" U.S. counterproposals are only "a repackaged earlier plan" which Washington submitted back at the previous Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva which, as we know, were broken off through Washington's fault. But the lovers of such "old melodies" try in vain to make out that those Geneva negotiations and the ones now under way are, as they allege, one and the same. Under discussion now is the entire range of issues concerning space and nuclear armaments -- strategic and medium-range -- in their interrelationship. These are qualitatively different negotiations, and they must be approached accordingly.

Alas, judging by the information "leaked" to the press, Washington is reluctant to abandon its attempts to achieve the disruption of the prevailing military-strategic parity to the advantage of the United States.

Although it is known that this is unacceptable to the USSR. Equally illusory are the calculations that we will "bless" the program for the development [razrabotka] of space strike weapons being pursued by the Pentagon. No "expanded interpretation" can justify "star wars," because Article 5 of the treaty states unambigusouly: "Each party undertakes not to develop [sozdavat], test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based." This article has not been questioned by the past four U.S. presidents from Nixon to, until just recently, Reagan himself.

Many observers are writing now about another, extremely alarming aspect of the U.S. Administration's approach to the forthcoming summit meeting. The so-called "regional initiative" being reiterated in the President's speeches and interviews has been assessed by many as an attempt to resurrect the long discredited "linkage doctrine" espoused in Nixon's era. "The essence of it is," the U.S. newspaper SAN JOSE MERCURY NEWS writes, "that if the Russians don't behave themselves as we would like, both at home and throughout the world, then we will punish them by refusing to conclude arms control agreements with them." Such "linkage," as the newspaper remarks, "excludes the idea that the reduction of nuclear arms is a good thing in itself, irrespective of regional conflicts and ideological differences."

The President's "regional initiative" is now being vigorously advertised by him and by other members of his administration. It betrays the desire to put the main problem of the reduction of nuclear strategic araments and the nonmilitarization of space on the "back burner," and to drown it in the discussion of other issues.

This does not mean, of course, that the USSR has nothing to say regarding the situation which has taken shape, primarily through the fault of the United States, in the most explosive regions, such as, for example, the Near East, southern Africa, and also on the borders of Nicaragua and Afghanistan, in Southeast Asia, and so on. But in examining such problems the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that it is possible to discuss only their international aspects, without encroaching on the sovereignty of the independent states involved in conflict. Something different is being proposed to us. The gist of the President's "regional initiative" amounts to the Soviet Union's not preventing the United States from "returning to the family of free nations," or to put it more simply, to "capitalism" in accordance with the Grenada "scenario," those countries against which Washington is waging undeclared wars through the hands of hired CIA agents and local reaction. Well, is it possible after Grenada to speak of Washington's serious approach to the solution of these same regional problems?

Built on lies

In one of his recent interviews the White House incumbent literally stated the following: "I'm no linguist, but I've been told that in the Russian language there isn't even a word for freedom." Then the president was informed that such a word did exist and, I would add, it has existed much longer than the United States. Yes, the president was informed, just as he was "informed" after he ascribed to V.I. Lenin the pseudoquotation cited in the "blue book" compiled by R. Welch, ringleader of the of the fascist John Birch Society. Yet the lie still spread.

Again and again the words of the eminent U.S. journalists W. Lippmann and (C. Merts) come to mind: "All the hysterical, endless, and complex intolerance of our time rests on the main lie -- the lie about Russia. The lie about Russia is the mother of all lies. It was a lie that they intended to invade a peaceful Europe. It was a like that Soviet Russia did not propose a peace with honor and guarantees..." these words were written roughly 65 years ago, back at the time of the civil war, but they have not lost their topicality.

White House officials have now taken to attempting to prove to the public that there is no sense in strategic nuclear arms agreements, not to mention banning the militarization of space, if it is not possible to agree with the Soviet Union that it "abandon its expansion." The story of the nonratification of the Salt II treaty by Congress is cited as a watertight argument. Using approximately identical expressions R. McFarlane, national security adviser to the U.S. President, White House Spokesman L. Speakes, and on 1 November even Secretary of Stage G. Shultz stated to correspondents that the "Salt II Treaty failed because of a regional question -- Afghanistan -- when President Carter withdrew it from ratification."

This is a double lie. The first and main lie is that all the changes in the world, especially revolutions that do not suit the United States are explained in Washington as "intrigues by Moscow" and "Soviet expansion," even though it is well-known that we do not engage in exporting revolution.

The second lie is the lie about the reasons for which the Carter administration failed to ratify the Salt II treaty. I recall that it was signed in June, and the limited contingent of Soviet troops was brought into Afghanistan at the request of the DRA Government at the end of December 1979.

Even before the treaty was signed the United States had initiated the intensive development [razrabotka] of a new generation of first-strike weapons -- cruise missiles, Pershing-2 missiles, MX ICBM's, the B-1 bomber, and the Trident system. At the same time the Pentagon and the White House embarked on the development of a new U.S. strategic doctrine, subsequently termed the doctrine of a "decapitating first nuclear strike."

After it had been signed and presented to Congress for ratification, a frontal attack on the treaty started, led inside the Senate by the well-known hawk H. Jackson and outside it by the committee on the present danger, the "hawks" strike association. Many hawks subsequently entered the Reagan administration and obviously well remember what happened. Back in September 1979 the Senate tried to "edit" the treaty to the advantage of the U.S. military-industrial complex and emasculate first and foremost the provisions imposing limitations on the arms race. Its ratification was "linked" with the "problem" of the existence of a Soviet military training center in Cuba that the CIA has suddenly "discovered." But when it became clear that the center had already been there for around 10 years, the inflated "Cuban crisis" was punctured. Ratification was then "linked" with "human rights in the USSR" and so forth. The pressure on Carter was so strong that in early December 1979 he removed the question of treaty ratification from the Congressional agenda on the pretext not of Afghanistan but of the "Iranian crisis," that is, after the seizure of the U.S. embassy in Tehran.

But this also was just a pretext. At the same time the United States was launching an active campaign within NATO to push ahead with the "two track decision," whose essence was basically that the bloc countries should pursue "two courses -- the modernization of tactical nuclear means and arms control." This phrase is taken from the NATO council session held 12 December 1979. The "two track decision" did not sanction the siting of cruise missiles and Pershing-2's in west Europe but merely stipulated that in December 1983 NATO would discuss whether it was necessary to site them. But nobody remembered that in 1983. The Salt II treaty was declared "dead." Subsequently the NATO leaders who participated in the session explained that they had taken the decision because the U.S. had persuaded them that without such a decision Congress would not ratify the Salt II treaty.

But the fact is that the administration had no intention of ratifying it. The treaty, as we can see, was to all intents and purposes dead and buried even before the events in Afghanistan. Subsequently these events have been used to justify this "burial," just as they are being used now by McFarlane and Shultz.

The joint message to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan signed by the leaders of Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, India, Sweden, and Greece notes that the world is pinning great hopes on the Soviet-U.S. summit. "All peoples and governments," the message states, "hope that you will succeed in halting the process of the buildup of tension of recent years and initiate an era of peace and security for the whole of mankind."

The Soviet Union is ready for this and is going to the upcoming meeting with the firm intention of conducting it in a constructive and businesslike manner and sets itself the task of achieving a substantial shift on the determining problems for Soviet-U.S. relations and the situation in the world as a whole. We hope for a positive outcome to this meeting. The USSR is doing everything in its power for this and has already taken a number of unilateral steps in the field of reducing, limiting, and freezing arms, including the moratorium on all nuclear explosion, which is being unswervingly observed. It is now up to the U.S. side. But the seriousness of its intentions will be judged not by verbal declarations but by concrete actions and steps.

REAGAN DIRECTS CIA TO OVERTHROW AL-QADHDHAFI

LD030906 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, November 3 TASS -- U.S. President Reagan has personally authorized the Central Intelligence Agency to carry out a covert operation directed at overthrowing the present government in Libya.

THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, quoting "informed sources in the U.S. Government", published some details today. The President adopted the decision to start the operation after American intelligence conducted a top-secret analysis of the situation that concluded that no substantial and lengthy changes can be expected to Libyan policy without the physical removal of the leader of the Libyan revolution, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi.

Inquiry Into Leak Ordered

LD041015 Moscow TASS in English 0904 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, November 4 TASS -- President Reagan has ordered an inquiry into the leak of information on a large-scale CIA covert operation to overthrow the leader of the Libyan revolution Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. This way the head of the administration actually confirmed the existence of this plan which constitutes nothing but a flagrant act of state terrorism. The CBS TV network reported that the leak of the classified information infuriated the President. Reagan is highly annoyed with the unsanctioned publication of the classified intelligence information and demands that the persons who are held responsible for it should be found and punished, AP news agency reports.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON LAO DEFENSE MINISTER'S VISIT

LD011819 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Today, in the Kremlin, Comrade Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Khamtai Siphandon, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, minister of national defense of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and Army General. In the ensuing conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, certain matters relating to the development of Soviet-Lao relations were touched upon. A desire was expressed to continue further cooperation in the military sphere. Kulikov, first deputy USSR defense minister and marshal of the Soviet Union, and Khaikhamphithoun, Lao ambassador to the USSR, were present at the conversation.

Speaks Over Moscow Radio

BK031054 Moscow in Lao to Laos 1300 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Statement by Khamtai Siphandon, member of the LPRP Central Committee, vice chairman of Council of Ministers, and minister of national defense of LPDR, to station correspondent -- date not given, recorded]

[Text] Though my visit to your exhibition is short, thanks to those responsible for the exhibition and those accompanying me to it I have clearly understood the history of growth and victories of the Soviet Army, an army worthy of being the heroic army of a heroic nation. At the same time, we have clearly understood the history of the revolutionary struggle of the Soviet Union beginning from the days of the Great October Revolution. We have further understood that the CPSU leadership is truly great. What I have seen convinces me that the Soviet Union is the beloved country of the great Lenin and also the native land of the Great October Revolution. Generations after generations of the Soviet people have inherited this tradition of heroic struggle. They have grown daily and become strong, thus serving as the mainstay of the world revolutionary movement and of the victorious socialist community. They always remain unswerving and resolute in defending invincible Marxism-Leninism and the socialist community. This shows that the entire Soviet Armed Forces have always persisted in great Lenin's foreign policy. They have not only shouldered the country's cause, but also brought into full play the tradition of the Soviet people, who always have a lofty spirit of proletarianism for the cause of the world revolution.

As you know, thanks to the Great October Revolution the Lao revolution came into being and has gradually attained victories, to which the Soviet Union has made important, effective, and great contributions. Regarding our Lao Army, its growth, development, and victories are attributable to the Soviet Army's practical experience and to the support and assistance of the Soviet Army and people.

Departs for Novosibirsk

LD021847 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1645 GMT 2 Nov 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Army General Siphandon, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party and minister of defense of the Republic, left Moscow today for Novosibirsk.

He is in our country on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of defense. He was seen off at the airport by Comrade Sokolov and other official persons. Among those seeing him off was Thongsavat Khaikhamphithoun, Lao ambassador to the USSR.

MALAYSIAN PRIME MINISTER RECEIVES RYABOV DELEGATION

LD022137 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1129 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Kuala Lumpur, 2 Nov (TASS) — Mahathir Mohamed, the prime minister of Malaysia, today received the Soviet Government delegation headed by Yakov Ryabov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which is here on an official visit.

During the conversation an exchange of opinions took place on issues connected with bilateral cooperation and its prospects for development in the trade and economic, scientific and technical, and other fields. Topical problems relating to the strengthening of peace and international security, and issues concerning the Southeast Asian region were discussed.

Y. Ryabov also met Rafidah Aziz, minister of public enterprises.

SRV NEWSPAPER PRAISES USSR DEVELOPMENT AID

LD031456 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Today marks 7 years since the signing of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. During the long years of the armed struggle which the Vietnamese people waged against foreign aggressors, the Soviet Union gave to Vietnam great and effective help and support. The treaty, which was signed 3 years after victorious Vietnam had reunited itself within the framework of a single, socialist state, raised relations between the two countries to a new, higher level. Just in the years of the current Vietnamese 5-year plan the volume of cooperation between the two countries has exceeded the scale of the preceding period nearly twice over. Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation is shown today by the Vietsovpetro, which is engaged in prospecting for oil recovery on the continental shelf in the south of Vietnam, the thousands of hectares of plantations in (?Gevey), which are equipped with modern laboratory equipment and the thousands of specialists trained with the assistance of the USSR. As the organ of the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party, the newspaper NHAN DAN stresses, the support and help provided by the USSR is an example of socialist internationalism, and serves as an important factor in the victory of the forces of the revolution in Vietnam and on the Indochinese peninsula.

GRISHIN AT OPENING OF CSSR-AIDED METRO STATION

LD012223 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Excerpt] The gallery of underground stations of the Moscow metro has acquired a new station, Prazhskaya. It is a vivid example of Soviet-CSSR cooperation. The first passengers were admitted here today. In line with tradition, they were the people who designed and built the station. A festive meeting took place at the station to mark the great labor victory of Soviet and CSSR underground railway builders. It was attended by Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, and Zavadil, the CSSR ambassador to the USSR.

Meeting With Beranek

LD030001 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 2030 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] The Soviet Union: A delegation of the capital, Prague, headed by Karel Beranek, secretary of the Prague City CPCZ Committee, was received today by Viktor Grishin, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom. The delegation took part in the ceremonial opening of the metro station named after Prague in the Soviet capital. The delegation laid wreaths this morning at the Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers at the Kremlin Wall.

SOKOLOV, OTHERS MEET CSSR ARMY POLITICAL WORKERS

PM011559 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Nov 85 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Guests From CSSR"]

[Text] A delegation of leading political workers from the Czechoslovak People's Army headed by Lieutenant General J. Klicha, chief of the Czechoslovak People's Army Main Political Directorate, was in the Soviet Union 28-31 October at the invitation of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, received Lt Gen J. Klicha, chief of the Czechoslovak People's Army Main Political Directorate, on 29 October. A talk was held on questions of mutual interest. Colonel General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, took part in the meeting, which was held in a warm and cordial atmosphere.

The delegation had meetings with Colonel General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. Taking part in the talks were Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Lieutenant General D.A. Volkogonov, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and other senior political workers. The delegation of leading political workers from the Czechoslovak People's Army familiarized itself with the experience of Soviet political organs' activity in carrying out the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee October (1985) Plenum and with the progress of preparations among the troops for the 27th party congress. The Czechoslovak comrades visited the V.I. Lenin Military Political Academy.

The delegation visited the Kiev Military District, where it had talks at the political directorate and at one of the district's formations and familiarized itself with the lives and combat and political training of the personnel. A Soviet-Czechoslovak combat collaboration rally was held in a Kiev Military District unit.

The delegation was received by B.V. Kachura, member of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. The Czechoslovak political workers laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall and saw the sights of Moscow and Kiev. The delegation of Czechoslovak People's Army political workers left for home 31 October.

ZAYKOV, BULGARIA'S DOYNOV DISCUSS COOPERATION

LD012257 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Zaykov today received Doynov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the BCP Central Committee and minister of machine-building of the Republic, who was in Moscow. During the conversation, which took place in a cordial and comradely atmosphere, certain questions concerning cooperation in the field of machine-building were discussed. Zhulev, ambassador of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in the USSR, was present at the conversation.

BCP POLITBURO APPROVES GORBACHEV VISIT RESULTS

PM011435 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "High Assessment"]

[Text] Sofia, 31 Oct -- A BCP Central Committee Politburo session held here has fully approved the information provided by T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, on the result of the friendly visit to Bulgaria by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Politburo, the report says, has highly assessed the meetings and talks with Comrade M.S. Gorbachev which took place in a businesslike climate, in an atmosphere of complete trust and sincere fraternal friendship. These meetings and talks confirmed the unity of views on all questions discussed relating to the domestic and foreign policy of the BCP and CPSU and Bulgaria and the USSR. They are exceptionally important for Bulgarian-Soviet relations. The accords reached at them are a new contribution to the further intensification of fraternal friendship and cooperation between the BCP and the CPSU, Bulgaria and the USSR, and the Bulgarian and Soviet peoples and accord with the interests of consolidating the unity and cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and of the cause of peace and progress throughout the world.

The Politburo expressed the firm resolve to continue to develop and intensify the course toward all-around cooperation and rapprochement between Bulgaria and the USSR. The implementation of this course will continue actively to promote the rapid assimilation of the achievements of scientific-technical progrsss, the acceleration of Bulgaria's socioeconomic development, and the satisfaction of the people's growing material and spiritual needs, the report states.

The BCP and Bulgaria will develop political contacts with the CPSU and the USSR at all levels even more intensively, coordinate their actions in the international arena more fully, step up collaboration in ideological work and in the field of culture, strengthen ties between the two countries' working people, and introduce Soviet experience more widely in various spheres of socioeconomic activity. Bulgaria will do everything necessary to develop production specialization and sharing and to strengthen direct ties between the two countries' enterprises, economic organizations, and institutions. Special emphasis was placed on the importance of creating joint scientific production associations with a view to further intensifying socialist economic integration. The long-term program for economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and Bulgaria for the period through 2000, signed in June this year, also serves these goals, the session noted. Its fulfillment will promote the further implemen-

tation of the BCP's general line aimed at building a developed socialist society in Bulgaria. The BCP Central Committee Politburo expressed the certainty that the Bulbarian Communists and all the country's working people, inspired by the new prospects for fraternal Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation and rapprochement, will continue to work still more vigorously to worthily greet the 13th BCP Congress, the report states.

LAWYERS SAY ROME TRIAL CHARGES UNSUBSTANTIATED

LD021035 Moscow TASS in English 2223 GMT 31 Oct 85

[Text] Sofia, October 31 TASS -- The investigation under way in the hall of the Rome court, the interrogation of the accused and witness accounts prove that the charges of the assassination attempt on the life of the head of the Roman Catholic Church, brought against three Bulgarian citizens -- Sergey Antonov, Todor Aivazov, and Zhelyo Vasilev -- are unsubstantiated, says a statement by the participants in a meeting of lawyers of the Bulgarian capital here.

The statement draws attention to an unusual procedural development of the judicial investigation into the case. This is expressed in the fact that without completing the interrogation of all the accused, the court opened hearings of testimony from witnesses. At the trial the matter went to the inadmissible from the point of view of Italian justice procedural violations on the part of public prosecutor Antonio Marini, aimed at searching for evidence of the non-existent "Bulgarian connection" in the assassination attempt.

As a whole, says the statement by Sofia lawyers, the course of the trial in Rome gives ground to consider until today that there is a certain bias in the selection of evidence, which is motivated by the prejudice, created already during the preliminary investigation, about the existence of the imaginary "Bulgarian connection."

ANTONOV TRIAL SAID EXAMPLE OF RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

LD030956 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 3 TASS -- The Antonov case has come to mean for the whole world an incontrovertible instance of all human rights, including the right to an impartial and objective trial, being grossly violated, the Sofia correspondent of the newspaper TRUD said today.

"It has become clear to the entire world," he said, "what is the real 'guilt' of Sergey Antonov, although the Western mass media have not been saying this bluntly to their readers and audiences. Antonov's 'guilt' is being a citizen of socialist Bulgaria, a country which has been chosen together with the Soviet Union and other states of the socialist community, as a target for imperialists' 'crusade' for which allmeans are good, including even lies, slander, twisted facts and perjury."

"Everything has been brought into play, except bourgeois propaganda's pet theme of human rights in the West. For some reason one does not encounter in the pages of bourgeois papers and programs of all manner of radio services even a mention of human rights in connection with the judicial show which is on in the Foro Italico Hall."

"It is a concern of every upright person on earth to defend an innocent person. Those who have a conscience cannot and must not keep silent when seeing an injustice, when the most fundamental human rights are being flouted openly and impudently. Conscience today is driving millions of people in different countries to form committees and societies in defense of Sergey Antonov. The millions are demanding that 'the disgrace of the century,' as the Rome trial is called, be stopped."

TEXT OF GORBACHEV LETTER TO KOHL DISCLOSED

LD011608 Hamburg DPA in German 1512 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Hamburg, 1 Nov (DPA) -- The Soviet party leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has warned Federal Chancellor Kohl not to take part in the SDI program. This is part of the reply handed over in Bonn on Tuesday by Gorbachev in response to a letter from the chancellor. The text of the letter was not announced officially. Passages are, however, quoted by BILD newspaper, whose editorial office reported on Friday that the 9-page letter, which was stamped "strictly confidential" and was distributed only to a few government members, had been passed on to them.

According to BILD, the letter states, among other things: "The question is basically as follows: whether the FRG Government will permit the material and scientific potential of the country to be used for highly dangerous military plans in space or whether your standing and influence will be brought to bear to help bring about mutually acceptable agreements in Geneva. It seems to me that the signals of goodwill on our part should have given rise to corresponding steps on the FRG's part. This is not, however, happening. With the approval of your government, the accelerated stationing of U.S. Pershing missiles is continuing on the territory of the FRG. Judge for yourself whether we can regard such action as contributing to the solution of urgent questions... I believe you will agree with me that the present, extremely complex and tense international situation requires statesmen and politicians of all states, whether large, medium-sized or small, to show a great sense of responsibility for the fate not just of their own peoples but for all mankind. The world has reached a point where an arms buildup and the arms race, in particular in the sphere of nuclear arms, may get totally out of control, with ensuing grave consequences for strategic stability and peace on earth. As long as the possibility of searching for a peaceful settlement of the problems is not permanently obstructed, political will must be demonstrated and everything possible must be undertaken to halt this threat, stop the arms race, and embark on the path to disarmament. This is an overall task [words indistinct].

According to BILD, Gorbachev repeats in detail his Paris disarmament proposals, which seek a reduction of nuclear weapons by 50 percent on both sides. The text then states: "I recall that on several occasions you said something to the effect that should there be a significant reduction in strategic offensive weapons, the need for a U.S. military space program would disappear. I make an appeal to advance precisely in that direction, and use space exclusively for peaceful purposes."

According to the paper, the letter makes a reference to the reduction of medium-range nuclear missiles: "In order to facilitate an agreement on a speedy mutual reduction of nuclear medium-range capacity in Europe, we propose the conclusion of a separate agreement on this. It seems to us that such an approach also meets your wishes." ..."In the reduction of Soviet and U.S. confrontation [gegenueberstehens] in medium-range missiles in Europe to a zero level, the Soviet Union would be prepared to have, in terms of warheads, no more such missiles in the European part than the number of corresponding British and French arms."

AUSTRIAN FINANCE MINISTER VISITS UZBEK SSR

GF040420 Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 0215 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] An Austrian Government delegation headed by Minister of Finance Franz Vranitzky is currently visiting the Uzbek SSR. The guests have become acquainted with the Uzbek SSR economic products exhibition and traveled to sites of interest and newly established rayons in Tashkent.

They also visited the scientific production union for horticulture, viticulture, and wine.

Comrade Kadyrov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers Presidium, received the Vranitzky-led Austrian delegation on 31 October. Helmut Liedermann, Austrian Ambassador to the Soviet Union, and Stanislav Borisov, deputy minister of finance of the Soviet Union, participated in the meeting. The latter is accompanying the delegation during its visit.

The Austrian delegation will visit Samarkand and Bukhara.

UK PARTICIPATION IN SDI DEVELOPMENT DEFINED

LD032321 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent V. Ilyashenko]

[Text] Despite protests by broad circles of the British public the Conservative government is faithfully following the militarist course of the United States.

Few people in London were surprised by the fact that NATO defense ministers approved the U.S. "star wars" program at their Brussels session. There was a greater echo here to reports that the leaders of the U.S. and British war departments had reached agreement in Brussels about direct participation by Britain in the development of the U.S. program.

The document that defines the conditions and sphere of Britain's participation bears the title: A memorandum of mutual understanding. This is not a fortuitous title. The dealing between the Pentagon and the British war department about the orders that British companies making electronic equipment , radar, lasers, and so on, can count on getting has been in progress for a long time.

Whitehall was counting on getting a substantial hand-out for the British military-industrial complex, totaling some $1.5 billion, in return for its political support of the "star wars" program. The Pentagon chief gave no guarantee concerning the value of the deal. But he has given assurances that about 20 British companies will receive substantial orders for research and development work on space weapons. So Washington's plans to drag Britain into the "star wars" program is becoming a reality.

It remains only for the governments of the two countries to approve the accord by their defense ministers. Britain will then become the first European country to take apart in the nuclear armaments race in space. It is expected here that the agreement will be approved before the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva. For the umpteenth time London is playing the part of Washington's trojan horse in pushing forward the nuclear ambitions of the United States in Europe.

Local commentators consider that the agreement will be a model for participation by the FRG and a number of other NATO countries in the U.S. program for the militarization of space.

COMMENTS ON NETHERLANDS MISSILE DEPLOYMENT DECISION

LD021859 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Report by International Affairs Journalist Eduard Kovalev]

[Text] The decision by the Lubbers government giving the go-ahead to siting [razmeshcheniye] of the U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons at the Woensdrecht Base contradicts the will of the majority of Netherlanders. Such a conclusion is being made by political observers, who comment on the situation which has taken shape in the Netherlands. Indeed, about 4 million voters, almost 65 percent of their total number, have signed petitions of protest which participants of the antimissile movement have gathered for handing over to the government. Hundreds of thousands of meetings and demonstrations, which have been conducted throughout the country by progressive antiwar organizations, show the true feeling of the population. The decision by Prime Minister Lubbers is an open capitulation in the face of unprecedented pressure on the part of the United States and NATO, which the Netherlands was subject to in the course of the past few months. It contradicts the national interests of the country. This was declared by the leaders of antiwar organizations who spoke at massive meetings held on 1 November.

Lubbers and his ministers, defending their position, assert that they are ostensibly prepared to negotiate with the East on the disarmament problem. They even say that the siting of the cruise missiles allegedly will make it possible to reduce the bulk of the Netherlands' nuclear obligations to NATO. All these assertions appear clearly illogical, taking into account the practical activities of the Netherlands authorities. Millions of rank-and-file Netherlanders, members of the antiwar and the antimissile movement, believe that the decision of Lubbers' government does not oblige them to anything. The opposition political circles point out that the next parliamentary elections are to be held soon in the country, where the parties opposing the nuclear arms race will be able, provided that they win, to suspend the realization of the agreement on siting the U.S. cruise missiles. The protest movement against turning the Netherlands into Washington's nuclear hostage does not intend to stop its struggle.

Changes Strategic Situation

PM031415 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 85 p 3

[Report by APN correspondent A. Ignatov. "Against the Will of the People"]

[Excerpts] The Hague -- And so the Netherlands Government, giving in to powerful pressure from the United States and NATO, has taken the decision to site 48 U.S. Tomahawk nuclear missiles on the country's territory. And the opinion of millions of Dutch people? The authorities have ignored it.

The deployment of the cruise missiles changes the country's strategic situation. The nuclear means which the Netherlands possesses as a member of NATO are tactical in nature. Their range is restricted to 300 km. But the Tomahawks are strategic weapons and can be used to attack the USSR. What is more, the cruise missiles remain on Netherlands soil in alien U.S. hands. Consequently, the state's participation in military operations through somebody else's will is possible.

No, it is with good reason that local peace supporters consider the siting of the new missiles to be an anticonstitutional step. To hand over the sovereign right to declare war into alien hands is forbidden by Article 92 of the country's Fundamental Law.

It is not the right-wing liberals nor the Christian Democrats, who form the present government coalition, but the Peace Party which is currently the largest political force in the country, comprising some 3.8 million people, that is every fourth inhabitant in the country, who voted for it. According to public opinion polls, 55 percent of the population share the pacifists' views. But it seems it is not the feelings or the convictions of the majority which decide, but something completely different. So what has happened to "democracy" then?

Public Protests

LD021022 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 2 Nov 85

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Georgiy Alekseyev]

[Text] Under unprecendented pressure from the United States and NATO, the Netherlands ruling coalition has taken the decision to station 48 U.S. cruise missiles on Dutch soil. This was done against the will of millions of the country's citizens, which is shown by the recent events. Yesterday, while the Lubbers cabinet was meeting to examine this question, protest action against the ominous NATO plans was taking place throughout the Netherlands. About 150,000 students and schoolchildren stopped their lessons and held demonstrations on the streets of The Hague, Amsterdam, Utrecht, Groningen, and other cities.

The day before, the government and parliament were handed a petition demanding that the stationing of the U.S. nuclear missiles be rejected. It was signed by 4 million Netherlanders; in other words, almost of every three of the country's adult citizens stated their unwillingness to see the cruise death on their home soil. There have been almost daily demonstrations outside the air force base in Woensdrecht, which has been chosen by the government for the proposed stationing of the missiles. That base has become a symbol of resistance to the dangerous plans. Considering the scale that the antimissile movement in the Netherlands has assumed, there can be no doubt that the struggle by its citizens will continue.

BELGIANS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST CRUISE DEPLOYMENT

LD021358 Moscow TASS in English 0935 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Brussels, November 2 TASS -- A demonstration of protest against the presence of U.S. cruise missiles in Belgium has taken place in fron of a U.S. military base in Florennes. Contrary to the will of the overwhelming majority of the Belgian population, six cruise missiles have been deployed at the base. Antiwar activists from the neighbouring Netherlands also took part in the demonstration, organized by Belgian peace campaigners. Their joint action became a manifestation of their solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of the two countries against the nuclear plans of the Pentagon and NATO imposed on them.

HUSAYN STRESSES NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE SETTLEMENT

Urges Soviet Participation

LD032304 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, November 3 TASS -- Speaking on American television, Jordanian King Husayn has rejected the possibility of separate deals with Tel Aviv. He stressed the pressing need for working for a comprehensive Middle East settlement with the participation of all sides concerned, including the Soviet Union. The Jordanian king pointed out that the main obstacle in the way of ensuring a just and lasting peace in the region is Israel's growing military power and the continuing occupation by Tel Aviv of the indigenous Arab lands.

Calls for International Conference

LD022144 Moscow TASS in English 2019 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Amman, November 2 TASS -- King Husayn of Jordan has again stressed the need for the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the parties concerned and urged to settle the Middle East conflict on the basis of U.N. resolutions. In a speech on the occasion of the beginning of the work of a regular session of the Jordanian Parliament, King Husayn strongly denounced the continuing occupation by Israel of Arab lands and described it as the most cruel and inhuman in modern history.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON BRUTENTS VISIT TO SYRIA

Meets With Syrian CP Leaders

LD011959 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Damascus, November 1 TASS -- The CPSU delegation led by Karen Brutents, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, who are curently on a visit in Syria have met with the Syrian Communist Party leaders -- Khalid Bagdash, general secretary of the party Central Committee, Yusuf Faisal, deputy general secretary of the party Central Committee, members of the Political Bureau of the party Central Committee.

In the course of the meeting views were exchanged on the development of inter-party ties and [word indistinct] of the CPSU and the Syrian Communist Party in the fight for peace and disarmament, against the threat of war and intrigues of imperialism, Zionism and reaction in the Middle East.

Discussion With Qaddah

JN031705 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1515 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Damascus -- Comrade Dr Sulayman Qaddah, Ba'th Party assistant regional secretary, received at 1000 today Comrade Karen Brutents, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and head of the CPSU delegation currently visiting Syria, and the accompanying delegation. The USSR ambassador in Damascus Felix Fedotov attended the meeting.

After welcoming the guest delegation, Comrade Dr Qaddah emphasized the firmness of friendship ties and aspects of cooperation which bind the two parties and peoples of the two friendly countries. He called for promoting relations in service of the interests of the two friendly peoples. He referred to the important role of the periodic meetings and visits among party and government leaderships, particularly the last visit of comrade struggler Hafiz al-Asad, Ba'th Party secretary general, to the USSR and his constructive and fruitful talks with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The visit brought about positive results which led to the enhancement of our country's principled stand in confronting, their imperialist and Zionist challenge.

Comrade Qaddah explained the latest developments in the region and stressed our country's determination, under the leadership of comrade struggler Hafiz al-Asad, to continue the struggle in order to abort the U.S. imperialist plans aimed at imposing its hegemony on the Arab region, to work to end the Zionist occupation of Arab territories, and to recognize the Palestinian people's inalienable rights including their right to return, self-determination, and establishment of a state on their national soil.

Comrade Qaddah emphasized Syria's persistent efforts to establish an efficient Arab solidarity based on confronting imperialist plans and the partial and separate solutions which U.S. imperialism and the Zionist entity try to impose on Arab countries. He pointed to the importance of enhancing the progressive stand based on opposing these policies in the Palestinian arena. He hailed the principled and firm positions of the USSR and the socialist bloc countries supporting liberation causes in general and the just Arab cause in particular.

For his part, Comrade Brutents reaffirmed the USSR's consistent and unwaivering stand supporting the Arab cause and hailed the wise policy and principled trend of Syria under the leadership of the Ba'th Party and its Secretary General comrade struggler Hafiz al-Asad, in confronting the hostile U.S. imperialist plans and the Zionist expansionist policy.

Makes Statement on Mideast

JN040751 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 0600 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Karen Brutents, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, has announced that the Jordanian-Palestinian agreement prejudices the PLO's representation of the Palestinian people and abandons the right to establish an independent Palestinian state. The Soviet official, who was speaking to the Syrian paper AL-BA'TH, added that the United States is increasing its pressure on both sides of the agreement in order to obtain more concessions. He said that delaying the U.S. arms deal for Jordan is the best proof of that.

On the other hand, Karen Brutents described the Israeli raid on the PLO headquarters in Tunis and the interception of the Egyptian airliner as terrorist and barbaric acts.

The Soviet official, who has been in Syria since last Monday, then spoke about the importance of the recent rapprochment between Syria and Jirdan and the final statement issued after last month's meeting between the prime ministers of the two countries. He said the statement indicated in particular the two countries' adherence to the Fes summit resolutions.

Brutents affirmed that the Middle East question will be discussed during the coming U.S.-Soviet summit. He also pointed out that the USSR will not change its principled stand on this subject. The Soviet official praised Syria's stand in confronting imperialism's plans in the Middle East and attempts to impose separate capitulatory settlements on the Arabs, as he put it.

IZVESTIYA REPORT DETAILS DIPLOMATS' KIDNAPPING

LD021653 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1509 GMT 2 Nov 85

["Freeing -- IZVESTIYA Report From Beirut" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS) -- ... Darkness had already fallen on Beirut, when three men approached the entrance-way of the Soviet Embassy, says the report from Beirut, published in IZVESTIYA. They were barefoot, dressed in well-worn sports outfits. On their emaciated, long unshaven faces were slightly grey beards; the warden on duty at first did not recognize them: They had changed so much. In a moment the joyful news flew round the whole embassy: "Our boys are back!." Thus ended the tragic adventure of the kidnap of the employees of the Soviet institutions in Beirut, which went on for about one month.

Together with embassy worker Arkadiy Katkov we had traveled not far from the army hospital at about midday on 30 September, when we were unexpectedly overtaken by a Mercedes and it forced us toward the pavement, -- recounts Nikolay Svirskiy, the embassy doctor. Arkadiy tried to reverse, but we were blocked from behind by another vehicle. We were surrounded by a group of people, who, threatening us with pistols, made us get out of the car. We just about thought that it was time to say good bye to the Lada, but the attackers had other intentions. When it became clear that they were going to capture us, we tried to run. They opened fire. Arkadiy was wounded in the leg.

On the same day, and about the same time, two more Soviet people -- Oleg Spirin and Valeriy Myrikov -- were kidnapped in a different district of Beirut. The kidnappers acted according to a similar plan.

Further on, all four had been kept together, but where and at whose place exactly, they do not know, for they were constantly blindfolded.

Two days later, Arkadiy was separated from the others, but Oleg, Valeriy and Nikolay have only learned about his murder now.

During the whole month -- Valeriy Myrikov says -- we did not receive any information. It was difficult psychologically, but we tried not to lose heart, cheering up each other in every possible way.

We had been absolutely confident that the search to find us was on. That we would be set free -- Oleg Spirin adds. But still when were able to step on the ground of the Soviet Embassy, we felt as if we were born again.

We had been absolutely confident that the search to find us was on. That we would be set free -- Oleg Spririn adds. But still when were able to step on the ground of the Soviet Embassy, we felt as if we were born again.

Naturally, all those who actively participated in the search for the kidnapped Soviet citizens felt relief as well. Particularly involved was a wide range of Lebanese state, political and relgious organizations.

The declaration of the Soviet Government, which contained a resolute condemnation of the criminal act and a demand for the release of the Soviet people held, found a great echo in the country. The appeals of social organizations and religious Muslim leaders in the USSR were met in a positive way.

Lebanon's mass information media emphasized that the USSR has not the least connection with the internal problems, with which the kidnappers linked the fate of the hostages, that the Soviet Union has always been the friend of the Lebanese and other Arab peoples, and a consistent supporter of the preservation of the unity, independence, and territorial integrity of Lebanon, and of the ending of bloodshed in that country, of a political settlement, and of the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese soil.

The news that the Soviet people had returned to the embassy spread quickly throughout Beirut. The night sky over the city was lit with thousands of threads of tracer bullets. With this salute the Lebanese in their tradition expressed their joy. A joy at the released of the Soviet men, the newspaper concludes.

JOURNALIST DENIES REPORTS ON MASS EMIGRATION

TA011410 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 1 Nov 85 pp 1, 11

[Report by correspondent in London Yosef Finkelstone]

[Excerpt] Viktor Louis, the famous Russian journalist who is close to the Kremlin, told our MA'ARIV correspondent in a telephone interview from Moscow that the various reports publicized in Israel and abroad concerning mass Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union prior to or during the Reagan-Gorbachev summit are no more than "wishful thinking."

Louis also criticized what he defined as Shim'on Peres' "ultimatum" to the Soviet Union regarding the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel. Viktor mocked the report which appeared in the prestigious LE MONDE, according to which during his visit to Paris Gorbachev proposed to President Mitterrand that France fly the Soviet Jews to Israel on Air France planes. Louis remarked mockingly: "Doesn't the Soviet Union have enough planes to fly any number of Jews to Israel if it wanted to? All these is nonsense. Bullshit. A lot of wishful thinking and nothing more. There is not a single hint for this possibility here."

In the past Viktor Louis has been the conduit through which the West has learned of the most important events in the Soviet Union, including the fall of Nikita Khrushchev, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the sharp cut in the number of exit permits for Jews last year. He also said yesterday that "it was possible there will be a slight increase in the present dribble of Jewish emigration. However it is one thing if Mr Shapira travels to Tel Aviv in order to reunite with his family, and completely another when a man pays $1,500 to reach New York. There is really no problem when the people in question sincerely want to reunite with their families in Israel. Otherwise it is an American problem. Ninety percent of the Jews who emigrated from the Soviet Union have immigrated to the United States.

When asked about the possibility of renewed relations between the Soviet Union and Israel, Viktor Louis said: "The Soviet Union was the first country to recognize Israel, so I would not rule out the possibility. However, Mr Peres had better avoid making ultimatums to the effect that unless the Soviet Union established ties with Israel it will be prevented from participating in Middle East peace negotiations. This attitude will not succeed. Relations must develop naturally and gradually. The question of the Middle East on the one hand, and Israel and Soviet Jewry on the other, are separate issues. Diplomatic relations with Israel must not be used to create the impression that Soviet Jewry have double-loyalty, toward Israel and the Soviet Union. People have said that a Soviet Jew is also an Israeli citizen, and therefore if relations are restored Soviet Jews will go to the Israeli Embassy and say: This is our embassy. Let us proceed gradually. In fact, it is already possible to phone Israel and to send telex messages there. These are normal things, and we must let them develop."

ARAB COMMUNIST PARTIES CENSURE ISRAELI POLICY

LD031250 Moscow TASS in English 1228 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Damascus, November 3 TASS -- The communist and workers' parties of Arab states have sharply censured the Israeli policy of terror and repression against the Palestinian population of Arab territories captured by Tel Aviv.

In a statement issued here they said that occupation authorities and all manner of extremist Zionist organizations have lately mounted a large-scale terror campaign in the occupied West Bank of the River Jordan and the Gaza Strip. Hundreds of Palestinians have been thrown behind bars without trial or investigation and dozens of intellectual and trade union activists deported beyond the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Zionist punitive troops have been using arms to disperse peaceful demonstrations and killing innocent people.

At the same time Tel Aviv has been illegally confiscating more and more lands belonging to Arabs and building more and more militarized settlements there. To create unbearable conditions for Palestinians and compel them to leave historically Arab lands, the occupation authorities have been destroying houses and crops and thus depriving Palestinians of means of subsistence, the statement said.

The communist and workers' parties of Arab countries urged all progressive and patriotic forces in the Arab world and on the planet as a whole to give effective support to the just struggle by the Arab Palestinian people against the occupation regime and for the restoration of their lawful national rights and strongly condemn Tel Aviv's aggressive, expansionist and racist policy.

GEORGIA SSR OFFICIAL ARRIVES IN BAGHDAD

JN032105 Baghdad INA in Arabic 2050 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Baghdad, 3 Nov (INA) -- Omar Vardzelashvili, deputy chairman of the Georgia SSR Council of Ministers, arrived here this evening at the head of a delegation on a visit of several days to Iraq. The Soviet delegation will participate in celebrations of the Iraqi-Soviet friendship days due to begin here tomorrow and lasting 2 weeks.

AMBASSADOR MARKS ALGERIAN REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY

LD020055 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; statement by Abdelmajid Allahoum, Algerian ambassador to Moscow; in French fading into superimposed Russian translation -- recorded]

[Text] Comrades, dear friends. Today, 1 November 1985, Algeria is marking the 31st anniversary of the revolution, a revolution, which after 8 years of selfless, heroic struggle which brought countless human sufferings, ended with the proclamation of Algeria's national independence. This date is written with blood in the memory of every Algerian and is the object of unfading pride for our people. It also has international importance, symbolizing the victory of an oppressed and humiliated people over the forces of colonialism, supported by international imperialism and reaction.

Before us, many peoples paid in blood for their liberation from foreign domination, from the misanthropic ideas and ideology of racism. One example is the great Soviet people, who had to defend their land with resolve unseen in the history of mankind. A socialist orientation is an inalienable part and fundamental principle of the Algerian revolution. It imbues citizens with a sense of responsibility and stimulates their creative activity. More than that, socialism is harmoniously combined with the spirit of the Algerian people, with its cultural values and traditions. This is why the day of the 31st anniversary of the start of our revolution, which is celebrated on the eve of Great October, Algeria once again confirms its adherence to the ideas for which it fought -- firm and resolute support for countries fighting for their political and economic independence, the development of international cooperation on the basis of respect for the sovereignty of states and noninterference in their internal affairs, the creation of a socialist state based on the principles of justice and freedom, and respect for national dignity.

Taking advantage of the opportunity that has been given us, we again express deep respect for the Soviet Union and its valorous people, whose indestructible friendship we always feel. Long live socialist, independent Algeria! Long live the Soviet Union!

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS GREETS YAR PREMIER

PM040959 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "To Mark National Holiday"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has sent Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] Prime Minister 'Abd al-'Aziz 'Abd al-Ghani a telegram to mark the YAR's national holiday -- the 23d anniversary of the 26 September revolution -- conveying sincere congratulations and best wishes to him and to the friendly Yemeni people.

In an answering telegram 'A. al-Ghani has expressed sincere thanks for the congratulations and good wishes and for his part has conveyed wishes for further progress to the Soviet people.

The telegrams express the certainty that friendly Soviet-Yemeni relations will continue to strengthen and develop for the benefit of the peoples of the USSR and the YAR in the interests of safeguarding peace in the Near East.

LOSEV SEES U.S. OBSTRUCTING MIDEAST SETTLEMENT

PM031442 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Nov 85 First Edition p 3

[Sergey Losev article under the rubric "Before the Geneva Meeting. The Arguments and the Facts:" "Who Is to Blame for the Conflagration?" -- first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The head of the White House recently declared that the discussion of "regional problems" should be regarded as of paramount importance in Geneva. But is the United States ready for such a discussion? In continuation of our rubric "Before the Geneva Meeting," today we publish an article providing an answer to this question.

In his latest radio address to the nation the U.S. President attempted to further boost the proposal for settlement of regional conflicts which was put forward in his recent UN speech. Reagan intends to make the so-called "regional initiative" "one of the key aspects" of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. In his turn R. McFarlane, the president's assistant for national security affairs, confirmed in an interview with ABC-TV that the administration will consider the main subject of the Geneva meeting to be not arms control but regional problems. He argued at length about the need for "some linkage" between arms limitation problems and the settlement of regional conflicts.

What can be said in connection with these pretentious claims?

The Soviet Union is pressing consistently and, most importantly, in deeds rather than in words, for new efforts in order to extinguish regional hotbeds of international tension. But what we are categorically against is the use of fruitless discussions on regional conflicts, for whose real settlement the U.S. Administration is clearly not prepared, in order to replace and put off the solution of the main questions of war and peace -- the drastic reduction of nuclear missile weapons, renunciation of the deployment of strike weapons in space, and creation of an atmosphere of confidence, cooperation, and security for all states.

The USSR has proposed extensive constructive programs for a political settlement in the Near East, Central America, southern Africa, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific and Indian oceans.

It is typical that, speaking about regional problems at the UN General Assembly jubilee session, the U.S. President diligently avoided those regions where Washington, in alliance with reactionary aggressive regimes, is trampling the peoples' rights to self-determination and independence. He deliberately steered clear of the Near East in particular, where the situation -- as the security council has repeatedly noted in its resolutions -- poses a serious threat to international peace. This "omission" is highly indicative. It is, after all, the U.S. Administration's approach to the Near East problem that demonstrates more graphically than anything else the hypocrisy of the White House's "regional program."

It would not be amiss to remind those whose memories are short that in the 1 October 1977 Soviet-American joint statemen on the Near East both sides expressed the conviction that a fair and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict must be comprehensive and must encompass all interested sides and all issues....

The Soviet and American sides consider, this document emphasized, that the only correct and effective way to ensure a fundamental solution of all aspects of the Near East problem as a whole is by way of talks within the framework of the Geneva peace conference with the participation of representatives from all sides involved in the conflict, including the Palestinian people.

If the provisions of this joint statement had been implemented, the situation in the Near East today would be completely different. But the U.S. Administration unilaterally moved away from this accord and, jointly with Israel's expansionist ruling circles, scattered the bricks which could have been used to build the structure of peace. It is Washington and its partner in the aggressive "strategic alliance" that are to blame for the fact that blood is still being shed in the Near East like before and the situation there still remains extremely tense and explosive. For eight years now the work of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Near East has been paralyzed. Instead of talks with the participation of all interested sides, Washington is stubbornly and insolently pushing the Arab states, and primarily Jordan, along the path of separate and unequal talks with Israel under conditions of continuing Israeli aggression, calculating that Tel Aviv will manage to dictate its will to the victims of aggression.

It was recognized in the Soviet-American joint statement that the framework of a comprehensive settlement must encompass the solution of all specific questions of a settlement, including such key issues as the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied during the 1967 conflict and also the Palestinian question including the guaranteeing of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights, the termination of the state of war, and the establishment of normal peaceful relations on the basis of mutual recognition of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence.

And what is the United States doing in practice? It is encouraging the consolidation of Israeli occupation, pandering to the policy of creeping annexation of primordial Arab lands, and preaching the need to maintain Israel's "qualitative military superiority" over all Arab countries together so that the aggressor can continue to threaten its neighbors and engage in brigandage in the Arab east.

As M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted at the Paris press conference, "we are alarmed by everything that is occurring the Near East. We have never dissociated ourselves from the quest for a settlement of the Near East situation on a just basis.

"The Soviet Union has always taken part and will take part in a fundamental solution, in improving the entire Near East situation, and it will act with a sense of great responsibility in this direction so that the situation in this region does not get out of control.

"Some people are not interested in the Soviet Union's participation. But the Soviet Union's presence in the Near East is an objective factor and we are not abandoning our role. We are in favor of collective efforts...."

The USSR has remained true to the provisions of the Soviet-American joint statement on the Near East. This was convincingly confirmed by the content of the Soviet proposals for a Near East settlement put forward by the Soviet Union in July 1984, when the Soviet Union expressed readiness to participate in international guarantees of such a settlement together with the other permanent menbers of the UN Security Council. The Warsaw Pact Member States' statement signed recently in Sofia points out that the participants in the conference expressed firm conviction that a comprehensive, just, and lasting settlement in the Near East can be achieved only through collective efforts by all interested parties on the basis of the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, the implementation of the Palestinian Arab people's legitimate rights including the right to self-determination and the establishment of their own independent state, and guaranteeing the right of all states in the region to independent existence and development. A practical path to this goal would be the holding of an international conference on the Near East under UN auspices with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO.

And if the U.S. Administration is really so interested in settling regional conflicts, why not start with the Near East, the most dangerous seat of tension in the world? Why not return to the implementation of the things outlined in the 1977 Soviet-American joint statement on the Near East?

But this is precisely what the White House no longer wants. With a persistence worthy of better application, the Reagan administration is opposing the resumption of the work of the international conference on the Near East.

The automatic conclusion from this is that the so-called initiative for the settlement of "regional conflicts" is being put forward now to distract the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting from the solution of the main questions. Washington would at the same time like to legitimize its interventionist policy in various parts of the world, primarily in Latin America, and the imperialist policy of economic suffocation and plunder of developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The USSR consistently opposes such a course, and the United States will never obtain our blessing on this count.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON MENGISTU VISIT TO MOSCOW

1 Nov 'Conversation'

PM041147 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 85 First Edition p 1

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev had a conversation with Mengistu Haile Mariam 1 November during which they continued the discussion of a number of questions of Soviet-Ethiopian relations and problems of the present international situation.

The conversation passed in a heartfelt, comradely atmosphere.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

PM041443 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian First Edition pp 1-2

(Speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at a 1 November Kremlin dinner in honor of Mengistu Haile Mariam, secretary general of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia Central Committee and chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Socialist Ethiopia)

[Excerpt] Moscow, 1 Nov TASS -- The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the Government of the USSR on November 1 gave a dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in honor of Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia and chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Socialist Ethiopia.

The officials accompanying the Ethiopian leader were present with him.

Present on the Soviet side were Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, A.A. Gromyko, N.I. Ryzhkov, E. A. Shevardnadze, B.N. Ponomarev, N.V. Talyzin, V.P. Orlov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; ministers and chairmen of USSR state committees; and other official figures.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a speech at the dinner.

Speech of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev

Dear Comrade Mengistu!

Esteemed Ethiopian Guests!

Comrades!

We are always glad to meet Ethiopian friends and you personally, Comrade Mengistu. During the talks that just ended, which passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust, a wide range of issues concerning Soviet-Ethiopian cooperation were discussed and an exchange of opinions took place on the situation in the world and on the African Continent.

The Soviet people sincerely rejoice at the successes and achievements scored by Ethiopia's courageous and hard-working people in molding an independent, free, and democratic country and sympathize profoundly with the social and economic transformations effected in the interests of the broad popular masses in your country.

Any unprejudiced person can see that in present-day Ethiopia, the people have broad opportunities for displaying its creative constructive potential and wide-open roads to knowledge and culture, democracy, and social justice. By far not every state that would have been able, had it found itself, like Ethiopia, under the unremittingly hard pressure of imperialist, reactionary forces and been hit by an unprecedented drought, to do as much for its citizens as that country has done today. It is not just to hundreds or even thousands, but to millions of people in the afflicted regions that food and clothing are being supplied and land and shelter are being provided in new areas that are more favorable in which to live and work.

Contacts with you, Comrade Mengistu, and with your associates -- and this meeting is no exception -- have convinced us of the Ethiopian leadership's broad vision and strong sense of purpose directed to serving the interests of the Ethiopian working masses.

And the people have responded to that by backing the policy of the workers' party and the government. There is no doubt that, by mobilizing the no small reserves of its own and using the help of its friends, the Ethiopian people will cope successfully with the major historic tasks that have been set by the 1st Congress of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia.

It is not the communists' "intrigues" or "the hand of Moscow," but a desire to overcome hunger and poverty, the absence of rights, and national strife that in 1974 drove Ethiopia's people to overthrow the reactionary imperial regime. The people of Ethiopia has itself established a democratic system of government which is independent of the forces of imperialism, and it is itself defending it.

So far as all manner of inventions and calumnies about Ethiopia, as well as distortions of the state of affairs in other progressive African, Asian, and Latin American countries are concerned, the rationale behind them is not difficult to see. They are first of all an attempt to cover up real U.S. interference in the affairs of these states and hinder their free and independent development. They also certainly show a desire to draw world public attention away from Washington's encouragement of the aggressive policy of such countries as Israel and South Africa and, of course, a striving to avoid giving an answer to the main question that now worries humanity: how to stop the arms race that has engulfed the world and prevent sliding into the abyss of nuclear war.

Ethiopia's international positions are stronger than ever. It enjoys by right a growing prestige in the world community and in the eyes of all who cherish the ideas of social justice, progress, and peace.

Following behests of the great Lenin, the Soviet Union has given and will continue to give revolutionary Ethiopia assistance and support. In recent years our countries have signed a number of agreements which have, together with the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation of 1978, formed a solid basis for their interstate relations and opened a wide scope for deepening them in political, economic, cultural, and other fields. Our relations are also being cemented by the increasingly strong bonds between the CPSU and the Workers' Party of Ethiopia.

The Soviet Union and Ethiopia, as I understand it, assess the present-day international situation and the causes behind its worsening in an equally sober way. The policy assumed by the forces of imperialism, led by the United States, of upsetting the strategic military equilibrium in the world and of taking social revenge is fraught with exceptionally dangerous consequences for all peoples of the world.

I can say with full responsibility that the Soviet Union is for keeping the arms race out of space and for coming to terms with the United States on reciprocal cuts in the nuclear armaments in question on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. Such is our will and such is our position for the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

At a recent meeting of their Political Consultative Committee in Sofia, the socialist countries grouped in the Warsaw Treaty expressed their conviction that, given the unity of action by all the planet's peace forces, it is possible to secure a return to international detente and check the arms race. This will benefit all humanity.

The developing countries will also, undoubtedly, benefit by that. The life of their peoples would change in a large measure, if at least a part of the hundreds of billions wasted on armament and rearmament is channeled to the resolution of the vital problems of their economy development and the elimination of hunger and diseases.

The all-round strengthening of the global potential of the forces of peace uniting all those who demand the elimination of the threat of nuclear war looming large over the world, is becoming an urgent task now. Life itself, and not in the least the growing activeness of questions of war and peace of the Nonaligned Movement, whose authoritative participant is Ethiopia, indicates that this is quite a realistic view. Predicatably, the militaristic circles of imperialism will further try to sidetrack the movement from that path, allege that "the true meaning of nonalignment" is breached, and advocate the so-called "equidistance." Yet there are no countries and people that would not be concerned with the issue of war and peace. The point at issue is mankind's very existence. Hence the need for an active stand by each country in defense of peace.

The resolutions of the Organization of African Unity announcing Africa to be a nuclear-free zone and its other decisions are evidence that the questions of ensuring universal peace are in the focus of attention of the governments and peoples of the African countries. We welcome the idea of turning Africa into a nuclear-free continent. Its implementation would, undoubtedly, improve in no small measure the general international climate, would be a real contribution of the independent states of Africa to the prevention of a nuclear conflict. The Soviet Union would be ready to observe the status of a nuclear-free Africa and ensure guarantees vis-a-vis such a zone depending on it.

The Soviet Union declares against turning Africa into an arena of confrontation of any kind, to say nothing of military confrontation. We believe that only the peoples of Africa have the right to determine their continent's future, to choose freely the ways for the development of their states. Nobody should interfere in their internal affairs or force on them an order that is alien to them. Africa is by no means a periphery of the developed capitalist states, as some people have gotten used to thinking since colonial times.

The Soviet Union builds its relations with the African countries on the basis of full equality, strict respect for their independence and equality, and support for the struggle of those countries against the neocolonialist policy of imperialism. We are for fair and mutually beneficial trade and economic cooperation with them so that the economy of the African states should strengthen and develop as a result of this cooperation and so that its peoples should gain the opportunity to oppose effectively the diktat of the imperialist monopolies.

The Soviet Union's policy in world affairs meets with understanding among the African states and peoples. This convinces us that we have many friends on the African Continent. The Soviet people know how to be a friend. They receive with respect and gratitude reciprocal striving for peace, especially from peoples with common ideals of peace and progress.

We wish you, dear Comrade Mengistu, the party and state leadership of Socialist Ethiopia and all the Ethiopian people major new achievements in your constructive work to build a new and fair society. We wish you peace, happiness, and prosperity.

Permit me to wish good health to our lofty guest -- Comrade Mengistu, the leader of Socialist Ethiopia -- and to all our Ethiopian friends.

May the close ties, friendship, and cooperation between the CPSU and Workers' Party of Ethiopia, the Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia, which are based on the principles of scientific socialism and international solidarity, continue to grow stronger!

A reply speech was delivered by Mengistu Haile Mariam.

Mengistu Dinner Speech

PM041155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 85 First Edition p 2

[Speech by Mengistu Haile Mariam, secretary general of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia Central Committee and chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Socialist Ethiopia, at a Kremlin dinner on 1 November]

[Excerpt] Dear Comrade Mikhael Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Dear comrades.

Permit me personally and on behalf of the Ethiopian comrades that have come with me to express cordial gratitude for the comradely reception accorded to us from the first moments of our stay in Moscow, the capital of the Soviet Union, the foremost country of socialism.

Our countries are linked together by relations whose roots go back into history. Since the start of the Ethiopian revolution, those relations have been developing and strengthening across the whole spectrum. We are firmly convinced that our talks with our faithful allies in struggle -- with you, Comrade Gorbavhev, and the other Soviet comrades -- will strengthen still further the relations between our countries, peoples, and parties who are bound together not only by a common aim, but also by blood. In his speech, Comrade Gorbachev touched our hearts by his comradely attitude to Ethiopia, to our revolution, and also to its leadership.

I do not think there is any need to go into detail about the many victories sustained by the Ethiopian revolution for our people. A year has passed since the Workers' Party of Ethiopia [WPE] became a reality. The question of setting up a Marxist-Leninist party was solved under conditions of a bitter ideological struggle which cost tremendous sacrifices. On the one hand, the young WPE strengthened organizationally over this period; on the other hand, it continues to exert great efforts to perform its vanguard mission.

Intense work is going on to create on Ethiopian soil, in accordance with the decisions of the founding congress of the WPE, organs of people's power of a new political system which is the first and most important condition for carrying through a social revolution. At the same time we are trying to improve the conditions of life for our people by transforming the country's backward economy which we inherited from the oppressors and exploiters of the feudal-capitalist system. The broad popular masses are already enjoying the results of our achievements in these fields.

At the same time, because of unceasing natural calamities and our imperfect techniques of land use, our country has come to face a severe trial. As a result of the current drought, many millions of our compatriots, particularly the peasants, have suffered from hunger and disease. But nevertheless, on the basis of the "program of action" worked out by our party, we have taken emergency measures and have been able to achieve impressive results in combating the calamity that has befallen our people. We will continue our efforts aimed not only at finally overcoming the consequences of the drought, but also at creating profitable production and completely socializing production relations.

People of good will from many countries have come to help us overcome this problem. On behalf of the Ethiopian people, I wish to take this opportunity to express particularly cordial gratitude to the Soviet people, the Communist Party and Government of the Soviet Union, and also to the whole socialist community for the enormous aid that has been given us.

The disaster which befell Ethiopia became, as it were, the ally of the bitter enemy onslaught being waged against us. But our country has considerable natural wealth, especially fertile virgin lands and abundant lakes and rivers, the assimilation of which gives us confidence that the drought problem will be solved once and for all. In this connection I wish to mention the tremendous importance attached to the development of Ethiopia's agriculture in the country's 10-year development plan.

We firmly hope, given successful use of the necessary capital investment and existing labor resources and creative potential of the people, together with the application of modern farming methods and an increase in the productivity of peasants' labor, that it will be possible at the end of the 10-year period to obtain additional produce. May I express the hope that in these ventures, we will constantly enjoy the help and support of the Soviet people, the Communist Party and Government of the Soviet Union, and of the entire socialist community.

There has never been a time when Ethiopia has not both expressed its good will and readiness to live in peace and goodneighborliness and establish mutually beneficial cooperation with the countries of the region, and put forward for that purpose constructive and concrete proposals which it was willing to realize in practice. It has repeatedly demonstrated its unity with the struggle of the socialist countries, of the progressive and democratic forces and all peace-loving peoples for the strengthening of peace and security and for the benefit of mankind.

One of the vital problems of our continent now is the question of liberating the peoples of southern Africa. The racist regime in Pretoria is trying to reanimate and prolong, unchanged, the existence of the obsolete system of apartheid. In an attempt to halt the wave of indignation that has swept the whole country, the racists are intensifying their repressions, shedding the blood of the fighters for liberation, and casting them into dungeons. Today, the successors of fascism -- the racists of Pretoria -- are feeling ever more keenly and directly the burning anger and protests of the African majority of the country's population.

The Pretoria regime continues to ignore the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, and the Nonaligned Movement and is not responding to appeals from peace-loving forces. Whether the racists like it or not, there is only one way -- to support the ANC [African National Congress], which is struggling to overthrow apartheid.

Besides this, the racists, on imperialism's instructions, are putting up all sorts of barriers along the path of achieving Namibia's independence. There is no doubt that the day is not so far away when the struggle of the Namibian people, waged under the leadership of SWAPO (South-West Africa People's Organization] will be crowned with success.

Once cannot fail to mention the racists' constant acts of aggression against sovereign "Frontline" states, the infiltration of hired saboteurs into their territory, and the insolent seizure of certain areas of the Republic of Angola. The racists" atrocities in the RSA and Namibia are nothing new. It should be pointed out that the American Administration is involved in and is directly guiding these illegal acts of international terrorism.

Taking into account the spread in this sphere of such activities, one cannot speak of the complete independence of the "Frontline" states or of other African states. It is clear therefore that it is the humane and historic duty of every progressive government, democratic forces, and peace-loving people to step up more substantially than ever the political, moral, and material support for national liberation in southern Africa.

Another question causing concern among the countries of the continent is the economic situation. The African economy, which has never been strong because of the constant fall in prices for raw materials and the growth of foreign debt, has, in conditions of economic crises and also as a result of the wars waged by imperialism and in unfavorable climatic conditions, weakened still further.

The 21st session of the Assembly of heads of state and government of the OAU countries examined with increased attention the continent's economic problems which threaten to get even worse, and worked out an action program in this connection. Since this problem has its roots back in the age of colonialism and is complex in character, its solution will require intense and massive efforts. However, the time is not far off when, as a result of a general upswing in the struggle of the peoples of Africa, the continent's natural riches and minerals will be put at the service of its true masters.

As is known, because of the arms race whipped up by imperialism and the conflicts kindled by it in various regions of the planet, the world is placed on the verge of catastrophe. Against the background of the socialist countries' efforts aimed at reducing arms and strengthening peace, it is now clearer than ever that imperialism threates to annihilate mankind.

The impression is being created that at the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States in Geneva, which has become possible thanks to the tireless efforts of the Soviet Union, which aspires to the restraint of these dangerous actions and of the arms race and to the slackening of international tension, the American side is not prepared for a dialogue which could bring the results awaited by the entire world community.

I am prompted to speak on this by the speech delivered last week by President R. Reagan at the 40th session of the UN General Assembly. The peoples of the world and all peace-loving forces of the planet expected that the results would be summed up in the speeches at the historic session dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the formation of this organization, of the activity of the UN Organization in the preceding period, and that constructive directions for its work in the future would be plotted and that the adherence of the UN member-states to the Charter would be affirmed.

It is particularly distressing for the billions of people hungering after peace that on the eve of the much-awaited talks in Geneva between the leaders of the USSR and the United States, at which questions of a reduction in arms and the strengthening of international security are to be discussed, President Reagan in his speech completely evaded the questions that are on the agenda of the forthcoming talks and confirmed his dangerous reluctance to restrain the production of destructive weapons. In his speech the U.S. President stressed that in no way is it imperialism's disregard for the interests of international security that is now the object of particular concern. According to his statement it is not the unrestrained buildup in lethal arsenals which threatens the destruction of mankind, and not the development of the "star wars" plans in the chase to achieve military superiority over the countries of socialism and all revolutionary, democracy, and peace-loving forces that are the particular danger.

He is trying to make it seem as if the main obstacle in the way of strengthening international peace is the struggle for social and economic independence that is being waged, at the cost of great sacrifice, against imperialism and its henchmen by certain developing countries that have freed themselves from the fetters of injustice, oppression, and exploitation. Moreover, in a speech remote from the true state of affairs, he is trying to put forward preliminary conditions for the Geneva talks and attempting, without the slightest wavering or the smallest qualms of conscience, to link that struggle with questions of disarmament and international security. The world community condemns this approach.

President Reagan thinks that the strengthening of international security is hindered by such countries as Cambodia, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, and Ethiopia. However, in President Reagan's speech to the international forum, not a word is said about the fact that it is precisely imperialism, and first and foremost U.S. imperialism, that is the chief threat to peace, the security and freedom of peoples, and social progress. Neither does it contain the slightest mention of the situation in southern Africa, which today has no analogy, the extermination of peoples of the Middle East and the problem of the independence of the Arab people of Palestine, the mass killing of people in the Iran-Iraq conflict, the bloody crimes committed daily by the fascist juntas of Central America which enjoy Washington's support, and the sufferings and deaths of millions of children as a result of the unjust international economic order, natural calamities, hunger, and disease.

Does President Reagan really hope that the people of the planet are not concerned or do not know about the new military bases and nuclear dumps already in existence or under construction, or about the dispatch of land and naval forces to Central America, Africa, the Middle and Far East, and in particular to Western Europe, and in general, throughout the world?

Are the armed forces of the Untied States in all these regions really envoys of peace, defending the interests of social progress and development?

Are the military maneuvers continually being conducted on the borders of independent and peace-loving states in various parts of the world under the codename "Bright Star" and the aggressive preparations really viewed by the American people as a musical concert or a circus act?

Those countries which in President Reagan's opinion are hampering disarmament and the consolidation of international security are in actual fact struggling against exploitation and oppression, racism, the threat of war, famine, diseases, and poverty; they advocate justice, social progress, and peace. Their struggle is a component of the national liberation and social revolution, of the movement for disarmament, detente, and universal peace. Moreover, they are making tremendous sacrifices in order to defend their existence and revolutionary gains. We are clearly aware that President Reagan's naming of our countries, particularly in the aforementioned speech, bears witness to imperialism's dissatisfaction with them, and for that reason we expect no complimentary speeches or gratitude from the U.S. leader.

Mention of our countries by President Reagan not only shows that they are the target of attacks on the part of American imperialism, but also demonstrates in general the hatred that imperialism and reaction have for socialism, as well as their vain attempts to regain their lost positions at our expense. Victory, however, cannot be won without sacrifice. In our struggle for the objectives we have set, we are willing to pay any price; but never will we make our revolution an object of bargaining.

All the peace-loving forces of the world have a high regard for and firmly support the efforts of the Soviet Union to curb the arms race and reduce existing weapons stockpiles.

In expressing wishes for fruitful results at the upcoming Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to reaffirm, Ethiopia's support for the forces struggling for peace.

Dear Comrade Gorbachev, Dear Soviet comrades:

As I have already said at the beginning of this speech, the people of Ethiopia have resolutely entered the struggle to create a society based on the principles of justice, equality, and peace, on the path to building socialism. We are fully aware of the need to work tirelessly and to struggle with determination if we are to achieve the aims we have set ourselves. We know that the traditional support of our allies in the struggle -- the socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union -- will be on our side, as it has been in the past; and that it will increase still more in this decisive transitional period of the Ethiopian revolution. We are firm in our confidence that despite the enemy's increasingly fierce opposition, victory will be ours!

In conclusion allow me to wish good health to dear comrade Gorbachev and the comrades present here and prosperity and peace for our peoples and countries.

The speeches by comrade M.S. Gorbachev and Mengistu Haile Marian were listened to attentively and greeted with prolonged applause. The dinner was held in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Mengistu Visits Lenin Mausoleum

LD021214 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Today Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia Central Committee and chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Socialist Ethiopia, visited the Vladimir Ilich Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath. A wreath was also laid at the tomb of the unknown soldier by the Kremlin wall.

Leaders Underline Ties

EA021559 Addis Adaba Domestic Service in Amharic 1000 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Report by correspondent Getachew Haile Mariam from Moscow]

[Excerpts] Comrade Mengistu Haile Mariam, Workers Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee secretary general, Provisional Military Administrative Council chairman, and commander in chief of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, is continuing his working visit to the USSR. This morning he laid a wreath at the Lenin Mausoleum. He also laid a wreath at the monument built in memory of Soviet citizens who gave their lives for their country during the Second World War, which was fought from 1941 to 1945.

Yesterday the comrade secretary general held talks all day [as heard] with Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU general secretary. According to reports from the meeting the two leaders held extensive discussions on bilateral and international issues and reached full agreement. During yesterday morning's first round of talks, great emphasis was placed on the drought problem which has affected Ethiopia and the efforts made and being made to overcome this problem.

The great effort being made by revolutionary Ethiopia to build a democratic and free country, the unity of the people in striving for this, and the satisfactory results achieved so far have won great admiration. In the speech, delivered during a dinner he gave in honor of the comrade secretary general in the Kremlin, Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev said that the social and economic changes taking place in revolutionary Ethiopia for the benefit of the broad masses have won the admiration of the Soviet people. He reiterated the support of his party and government and of the entire Soviet people for this effort.

Our comrade revolutionary leader observed that the relationship between the two countries is long-standing. He said it is bound with historical [word indistinct]. He added that it has grown stronger in every respect since the outbreak of Ethiopia's revolution. He expressed the hope that it would be further strengthened in future.

CPSU DELEGATION LEAVES VENEZUELA FOLLOWING CONGRESS

PM311612 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Departure for Home"]

[Text] Caracas, 30 Oct -- The CPSU delegation headed by G.V. Kolvin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Ulyanovsk CPSU Obkom, which took part in the work of the Seventh Communist Party of Venezuela [PCV] Congress, has departed for home. At the international airport it was seen off by PCV Secretary General Alonso Ojeda, PCV President Jesus Faria, and other officials.

ARISTOV MEETS WITH CUBAN VICE TRADE MINISTER

PM021347 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ties Strengthening"]

[Text] On 30 October USSR Foreign Trade Minister B.I. Aristov received G. Amado-Blanco, Cuban first vice minister of foreign trade. Questions of the USSR's trade relations with the Republic of Cuba in 1986-1990 were discussed.

PRESIDIUM GREETS MEXICAN PRESIDENT ON NATIONAL FETE

PM040943 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado, president of the United Mexican States, a telegram conveying sincere congratulations and best wishes to him and to the friendly Mexican people on the national holiday of the 175th anniversary of the proclamation of indepe-dence.

The Soviet Union, the telegram says, prizes Mexico's contribution to the struggle to normalize the international situation: to the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, the halting of the arms race, the peaceful settlement of conflict situations, and equal cooperation between states.

In a telegram in response, the Mexican president expressed sincere thanks for the warm congratulations.

The telegrams express the conviction that relations between the Soviet Union and Mexico will be further developed for the benefit of both peoples, in the interests of world peace and international security.

NICARAGUA CONDEMNS U.S. POLICY, ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

LD031211 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Managua, November 3 TASS -- the U.S. Administration's decision to tighten the economic blockade of Nicaragua is part of American imperialists' overall effort to escalate their criminal aggression against the Sandinist popular revolution, Nicaraguan Foreign Trade Minister Alejandro Martinez told a news conference here.

He flatly rejected Washington's allegations, made to justify the latest act of hostility, that his country is threatening U.S. security.

The American Administration's economic sanctions, Martinez said, effectively demonstrate the imperialist substance of the policy it maintains towards independent developing states, trying to force them to their knees by raw pressure and blackmail.

The U.S. actions, the Nicaraguan foreign trade minister said, contradict basic international norms and have been strongly condemned by the United Nations and world public opinion in general.

The U.S. economic aggression has done serious damage to Nicaragua. After the overthrow of the pro-American Somoza dictatorship the Nicaraguan Government has begun expanding the country's trade and economic relations. Nicaragua's cooperation with Latin American, European, Asian and African countries has been developing successfully. Appreciable economic assistance has been given to it by socialist states which have been demonstrating disinterested solidarity with the Nicaraguan people, Martinez said.

Commenting on Washington's impudent demand that the National Assembly of Nicaragua be dissolved as a precondition for resuming bilateral talks, the news agency NUEVA NICARAGUA said the U.S. administration has adopted "the law of the jungle" in relations with Central American countries. The White House has firmly maintained a policy of suppressing the Sandinist Popular Revolution which has been a hindrance to Washington's attempts to establish undivided domination in the region and dictate to its nations.

Washington's latest move to escalate military, political and economic aggression against Nicaragua has been vigorously denounced by Nicaraguan public figures and politicians, including members of opposition parties. Eduardo Molina, national coordinator of the Conservative Democratic Party, described Washington's arrogant claims as "interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua." The National Assembly, said Luiz Humberto Gusman, a leading member of the Popular Social Christian Party, has been elected in the country's first-ever free election and the Nicaraguan people will defend it by all available means.

The newspaper BARRICADA, official organ of the Sandinist National Liberation Front, urged the Nicaraguans to close their ranks in the face of the escalating American aggression. The toughened U.S. economic boycott, it said, has been directly linked with other aggressive actions against Nicaragua, including the impudent demand by the White House that the National Assembly be disbanded, the started distribution of latest multimillion-dollar appropriations among Somicist mercenary gangs and the Pentagon's threats to resort to a direct military intervention against Nicaragua.

SAKHAROV'S WIFE TO DEPART 'END OF NOVEMBER'

AU011605 Paris AFP in English 1601 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Excerpt] Moscow, Nov 1 (AFP) -- Yelena Bonner, the wife of dissident Soviet physicist Andrey Sakharov, has said she will leave the Soviet Union at the end of November, a dissident source said today.

The confirmation came in telegram sent by Mrs Bonner from the closed town of Gorkiy, 400 kms (250 miles) east of Moscow, to friends in the Soviet capital, the sources said.

The key passage of the telegram whose authenticity is not doubted by its recipients, reads: "Have received permission to leave. Will leave end November in order to prepare everything to enable Andrey to spend the winter without me."

A top Soviet source, journalist Viktor Louis, indicated to Western correspondents here three days ago that Mrs Bonner had been granted a three-month exit visa "for the country of her choice" by Soviet authorities.

She had been widely expected since Tuesday to leave the Soviet Union to receive treatment for a heart condition and for an eye complaint.

On this basis, therefore, Mrs Bonner, 61, would return to Gorkiy, where she and her husband live in internal exile, in late February or early March. In the past, Soviet officials have said that Mr Sakharov would not be allowed to go abroad because of his key top-secret work, more than 30 years ago, in developing the Soviet H-bomb.

REPORTAGE, COMMENT ON DRAFT CPSU STATUTES

PRAVDA Editorial

PM031937 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Law of Communists' life"]

[Text] As the 27th CPSU Congress draws ever closer, the collective thinking of the party and people is working increasingly intensively and fruitfully. Our main concern today is to accelerate the country's progress along all the strategically important avenues. And this will be assisted by the partywide and nationwide discussion of the precongress draft documents approved by the CPSU Central Committee October (1985) Plenum.

Yesterday the Draft CPSU Statutes (with proposed amendments) were published. Like the draft of the new edition of the CPSU program, it is to be examined comprehensively at party meetings, rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray conferences, and union republic communist party congresses. The most important thing here is a businesslike tone of discussion and the close coordination of the exchange of opinions with the specific tasks of party organizations and labor collectives and the search for additional reserves to successfully fulfill the 1985 State Plan and socialist pledges and make a vigorous start in the 12th 5-Year Plan.

The nature of the changes in the statutes has been occasioned by the times. The scale, depth, and complexity of both the domestic and the foreign policy tasks being tackled make new and increasingly high demands on the standard of party leadership and insistently dictate the need to master new approaches to all party work. Naturally, this cannot fail to be reflected in the CPSU Statutes -- the party's fundamental law and the code of Communists' life.

The proposed amendments take account of the accumulated experience of party building and Communists' wishes and bring the demands of the existing statutes into line with the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program. There is a direct and indissoluble link between these documents. Whereas the program in Lenin's words, is a "brief, clear, and accurate statement of everything that the party is seeking and for which it is struggling," the statutes are a "general decision regarding forms and norms of party organization," the "jointly adopted rules of the organization..." Thereby the unity of the ideological and organizational foundations of the party and of theory and practice is guaranteed.

Created by V.I. Lenin, the CPSU has traveled a glorious path. Under its leadership the sociopolitical and ideological unity of multinational Soviet society was established and is constantly strengthening. Worthily fulfilling its mission of tested combat vanguard of the Soviet people, nucleus of the political system and guiding and directing force of society, the party determines the general prospects for the country's development and imparts organization, planning, and purposefulness to the struggle for the triumph of communist ideals. As the scale and complexity of the creative tasks grow, its leading role and, consequently, its responsibility to society and the people also increase.

The essential thrust of the proposed amendments to the statutes consists, on the one hand, in further expanding internal party democracy and developing the initiative and activeness of Communists and all party organizations and, on the other hand, in improving their responsibility for the fate of common matters. The more multifaceted and intensive internal party life is and the more profound the democratism in tackling key questions -- from admission to the party to cadre policy -- the more powerful and effective is the party's influence on all social processes.

The CPSU, the published document says, builds its work on the basis of unswerving observance of the Leninist norms of party life, the principles of democratic centralism, collective leadership, all-around development of internal party democracy, the creative activeness of Communists, criticism and self-criticism, and broad publicity.

The party has been and remains true to Lenin's principles of membership. The conditions for admission into the ranks of the CPSU, which it is envisaged will take place as a rule at open party meetings, are immutable. They include political, businesslike, and moral qualities and the readiness to devote oneself wholly to the cause of communism.

Membership in the CPSU neither promises nor gives a community any privileges or advantages but only lays on his shoulders a considerably greater responsibility for his every step and for everything that is done in the labor collective and in the country.

Although it has become today the party of the whole people, the CPSU in its class essence and ideology was and remains a working class party. For that reason it deems it necessary for workers to occupy the leading place in its social composition.

The draft formulates Communists' duties more fully and comprehensively. All Communists are obliged to firmly and unswervingly implement the party's general line and directives, to organize working people to implement its policy, and to set an example of a conscientious and creative attitude to work, high organization, and discipline. They must persistently strive to improve production efficiency and ensure steady growth in labor productivity.

They are required to assert everywhere the principle of social justice inherent in socialism, to display modesty, probity, and sensitivity and attentiveness toward people, and to set an example in behavior and public and private life. The proposed amendments to the statutes serve to boost the prestige, name, importance of party members and their honor and role as political fighters and organizers of the masses.

The firmness of the party's ties with the masses and its prestige largely depend on how conscientiously and responsibly Communists carry out their vanguard role. Proceeding from this, the CPSU is stepping up demands on each of its members for ensuring an irreproachable attitude to duty and the honest makeup of a party member. Nobody in the party can be beyond control.

Communists are assessed by a single criterion -- their deeds and actions. As was the case under V.I. Lenin, double responsibility -- to the state and the party -- is being introduced for violations of Soviet laws by Communists. The manifestations in certain places of "half-hearted" demandingness in the approach toward those who besmirch the pure name of a Communist should thereby be ended. This will also probably dampen the ardor of those who try to infiltrate the party "for their careers" and other selfish motives.

While striving to consistently implement the democratic principles of intraparty life, the CPSU is at the same time steadily strengthening party discipline -- discipline that is uniform and compulsory for all, irrespective of their services and the posts they hold. It is this discipline that is the guarantee of the unity and cohesion of Communists' ranks. It is also the guarantee of firm and conscientious discipline in all spheres of our life.

The CPSU's successful activity, the growth of Communists' activeness, and the improvement of intraparty relations cannot be divorced from increasing the combativeness of primary organizations. As the basis of the CPSU and the political nucleus of labor collectives, they are called upon to promote in every possible way the maximum harnessing of party policy and the masses' living creativity. That is why the draft considerably expands the functions of primary organizations. For instance, the role of their active participation in implementing the party's cadre policy is particularly noted. The provision stating that a Communist who has committed a misdemeanor is to be accountable for it first and foremost to his party organization adds also substantially to the statutes.

With a view to further asserting and developing the principle of collectiveness, which, as Lenin defined it, is the supreme principle of party leadership, the CPSU deems it necessary to increase the role and importance of party meetings, plenums, conferences, congresses, committees, and bureaus as collegial leadership organs.

The draft introduces a new section into the statues: "The Party and State and Social Organizations." Here the main principles of party leadership of various components of our political system are specified and developed. Each of these organizations is called upon to fully carry out its functions, and party leadership of them must be distinguished by a precisely expressed political nature. Duplication, substitution [podmena], and willful decisions are impermissible. It is necessary to assert more vigorously the Leninist principles and methods of leadership and the Leninist style in work, to eradicate more boldly any manifestations of conservatism, conventionalism, and bureaucratism, and to improve verification of the execution of decisions.

There is no doubt that the partywide discussion of the timely honing of the CPSU Statutes will enrich them still further with new provisions and conclusions and will promote the organizational strengthening of the CPSU and the strengthening of the effectiveness of party leadership.

Changes Discussed

LD021453 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Commentary by Doctor of History Valentina Ivanovna (Lukyanenko), professor in the department of party structure of the Central Committee's Academy of Social Sciences, on the "Time, Events, People" program]

[Text] The draft changes in the CPSU Statutes, which the Party Central Committee is submitting for discussion at party meetings, conferences, and congresses of communist parties of the union republics preceding the 27th Party Congress, were published in the press today. The broadest strata of the country's population have the opportunity to participate in the discussion of the drafts which have been published. The Statutes are the party's constitution, the code of party life. They embody the party's Leninist organizational foundations, the norms of party life stemming from them, and the principles of party leadership. The forms of the structure of the party and the methods of its practical activity are defined, as well as the methods for leadership of state and public organizations of working people. The Statutes are indissolubly connected with the program and take its provisions as their origin, they are in accordance with it. But unlike the program, this document is more practical and flexible. It is to be noted that while our party has adopted 3 programs in the time it has existed, it has adopted 12 sets of statutes. This goes to show that the party attaches exceptional signifiance to organization at all stages of its revolutionary activity, and puts forward organizational forms and establishes rules for its internal life such as are in accordance with the historical conditions and which ensure the fulfillment of its programmatic aims and tasks.

It is a rule that the party has introduced the biggest changes and additions to the Statutes at turning points in the development of Soviet society, in periods when it was faced with tasks of immense complexity and when forms of organization in accordance with the new content of its activity had to be brought in. Our country has now entered just such a stage, the stage of development socialism. In his report at the October 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed that the present exceptionally complex and crucial segment of history is of the nature of a turning point both in a domestic and an international context. The scale, profundity, and complexity of the tasks being resolved present new demands for the level of party leadership and dictate the need for fresh approaches to all aspects of party work. It is for this reason that it is written in the draft CPSU Statutes that a party member is first and foremost obliged to implement firmly and unswervingly the party's general line and directives, to explain the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy to the masses, to organize the working people for implementation of it, and to promote the strengthening and expansion of ties between party and people.

The party presents cadres with special demands. The draft statutes stress not only business and political qualities, and their importance, but also the moral qualities of leaders.

All this goes to show that the changes in the currently effective Statutes are directed toward the further expansion of the internal life of the party, of internal party democracy, and toward the development of Communists' initiative and activeness, at the same time enhancing their responsibility for the resolution of the tasks facing the country.

It is important to note that the proposed changes are aimed at enhancing the authority, the title, and the importance of the party member, his role as a political fighter and organizer of the masses for the successful resolution of the tasks of the accelerated socioeconomic development of the country.

The perfection of socialism insistently demands the development of the creative initiative and activeness of the masses, the further development of socialist self-government of the people in all sectors and at all levels. Taking this into account, exceptional importance is acquired by the principles of party leadership of state and public organizations which are refined in the Statutes. The party stresses anew that each of these is called upon to execute its functions to the full, while party leadership of their activities must bear a clearly expressed political character. This is completely in accordance with the party's role and place in the political system of Soviet society.

The proposed changes to the CPSU Statutes develop the Leninist organizational foundations of the party, they enrich the principles and norms of party life, and the principles of party leadership. They are directed toward enhancing the party's leading role in the stage of development socialism.

Comment on Party Statutes

LD030008 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] The Soviet press today published the CPSU Statutes and their proposed changes. Following their discussion by the Party membership, these changes will be approved at the forthcoming 27th CPSU Congress. Our Moscow correspondent Stefan Simak met with Professor Doctor Rudolf Janovskiy, rector of the Moscow Academy of Social Sciences and asked about the essence of the proposed changes.

[Begin Janovskiy recording in Russian fading into Czech translation] The statutes represent a fundamental code of our Party life. Twenty-three years ago we adopted the present statutes: Partial changes in their contents were approved 15 years ago by the 24th CPSU Congress. Since that time the Party has acquired new experience in the management of the economic and cultural construction of the country. The development of intra-Party life has acquired new level. At present the party is introducing new tasks in the interests of accelerating economic and social development. All this brought about the elaboration of the Statutes, which fully correspond to our requirements.

The main significance of the proposed changes rests in further development of intra-party democracy, and also in the increased responsibility of Party organizations -- namely that of primarly organizations -- for the state of affairs in their provinces. The statutes provide a more precise formulation of duties and rights of a Party member, deal with admissions of new members, and define more precisely the basic principle of the party's influence on the activity of state, economic and social organizations. We expect, that these measures will contribute toward the increase of authority, activity and discipline of each Communist. At the same time the new statutes emphasize the Leninist principle of dual responsibility of Communists before the Party and before the people.

For this regular inspection is required. The changes in the statutes' content, which wil' be approved by the 27th Congress after their discussion by primary organizations, correspond to the achieved level of development of Soviet society and to the requirements of communist construction.

TASS Explanation

LD011417 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 1 TASS -- The draft rules of the CPSU with proposed changes, approved by the latest plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee (October 15, 1985), have been published here.

The changes proposed in the rules are meant, on the one hand, further to broaden intra-party democracy and to promote the initiative and activity of the communists and all the party organizations, first and foremost primary organizations, and on the other, to enhance their responsibility for the accomplishment of common tasks.

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the tried and tested militant vanguard of the Soviet people, which unites, on a voluntary basis, the more advanced and politically more conscious section of the working class, collective farm peasantry and intelligentsia of the USSR," the draft says. The draft says that the CPSU, "while remaining, in its class nature and ideology, a party of the working class, has become a party of the whole people".

"The party exists for, and serves, the people. It is the highest form of socio-political organization, the nucleus of the political system, and the leading and guiding force of Soviet society. The party determines the general perspective for the development of the country, ensures scientific leadership of the creative activities of the people, and imparts an organized, planned and purposeful character to the struggle to achieve the ultimate goal, the victory of communism," the draft says.

The CPSU, the draft continues, "is an integral part of the international communist movement. It firmly adheres to the tried and tested Marxist-Leninist principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism, actively promotes the cooperation and cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries, the consolidation of the world socialist system, the unity of the international communist and working class system, the unity of the international communist and working class movement, and displays solidarity with the peoples fighting for national and social liberation, against imperialism and for a lasting peace."

The proposed changes, as the October plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee noted, will help raise the prestige, authority and importance of membership in the party and the role of the party member as a political fighter and organizer of the masses, and also his responsibility for the implementation of the party's general line and directives.

"On the whole, the suggested changes to the party rules," General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out at the plenum, "will enrich it with new provisions meeting the demands of life, will help strengthen the party organizationally on the basis of the tried and tested principles of democratic centralism and enhance the leading role of the CPSU in face of the new tasks confronting the country."

The CPSU rules incorporating the changes suggested have been published in the press for discussion in party organisations.

Academician on Significance

LD022236 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Interview with Professor V. Ya. Bondar, department head of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee, by correspondent G. Sedov, on the draft CPSU rules and the proposed amendments; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] The basic significance of the amendments to the rules consists, on the one hand, in ensuring the further expansion of democracy within the party and the development of the activeness and initiative of Communists and all party organizations. On the other hand, it consists in increasing their role in the struggle for a common cause at a time when our party is setting the task of comprehensively perfecting socialist society. Complete implementation of the rules' demands a steadfast struggle to put the party's general line and directives into practice, rigorous observance of the norms of party life is the foremost duty and obligation of every communist and party organization. The published document will undoubtedly play an exceptional role in the life of our party and of the entire Soviet people.

ZIMYANIN VORONEZH SPEECH REPORTED

PM040951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 85 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Vanguard of the Struggle for the Acceleration of Scientific and Technical Progress"]

[Text] Voronezh, 27 Oct -- The report and election meetings in the grassroots party components of the Voronezh Eliktronika production association took place in an atmosphere of exactingness and searching criticism and self-cricism. The communists discussed in detail and in a businesslike fashion questions of improving production efficiency and output quality, improving organizational and ideological activity, and restructuring the style and methods of work in accordance with the demands of the CPSU Central Committee April and October (1985) Plenums and the directives of the CPSU Central Committee conference on questions of accelerating scientific and technical progress.

This major party discussion of urgent tasks and plans was continued and deepened at a report and election party conference held in the association yesterday. M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part.

The conference took its special businesslike mood from the document of tremendous theoretical and political significance that has just been published in the press -- the draft new edition of the CPSU Program. It was stressed in the party committee's report and the speeches that this document will be a reliable, accurately tested guide in communist building.

How to make your contribution to the fulfillment of the program for accelerating the country's socioeconomic development and the desire to go further and achieve more -- that thought ran right through the conference speeches. It was noted that the association's collective, many thousands strong, works persistently and stably. The 5-year plan targets for the rate of increase in labor productivity were completed ahead of schedule. Production of many new types of electronic equipment has been started up. Output worth millions of rubles has been sold above plan. The collective has already worked 2 days on saved resources this year. The main avenue in the enterprise's development is the introduction of flexible automated systems into production and the creation of automated shops.

But, measuring achievements against the demands put forward by the party in the sphere of economic and social building, the speakers said that not all reserves have yet been brought into play. There are many sectors at the enterprise where work requires improving. The association has not yet achieved 100-percent fulfillment of pledges for output deliveries, and losses from the production of spoiled articles are falling too slowly.

Ways of improving party and economic work in the collective and measures to overcome shortcomings were mentioned by V.M. Meshcheryakov, secretary of the association's party organization; operator N.I. Kushnir; assistant foreman V.I. Lukina; milling machine operator S.I. Pakkuyev; foreman M.I. Savinkova; engineer S.V. Klyuchantsev: B.L. Tolstykh, general director of the association; and others, in their speeches.

While analyzing in depth the work of various subunits of the association, the delegates devoted great attention to the means and methods of stepping up the human factor and increasing output from every working person.

M.V. Zimyanin spoke at the conference.

Your association's party conference, he said, is taking place at a significant time. The CPSU is preparing for its 27th congress, and all the Soviet people are preparing with it for the congress of their Leninist party.

The CPSU Central Committee April Plenum put forward the strategic concept of accelerating our motherland's socioeconomic development on the basis of the all-around intensification of production in order to achieve a qualitatively new state.

The CPSU Central Committee and the entire party set the task of ensuring an abrupt turn in the development of our economy and in the country's socioeconomic development in general as early as the 12th 5-Year Plan. A program for accelerated forward movement -- a program which is scientifically substantiated and realistic and is based on our motherland's mighty material and spiritual potential, our people's great creative genius, the party's collective intelligence, and Soviet people's growing creative, labor, and political activeness -- has been elaborated. This, comrades, is the most important characteristic of the work of our party's Central Committee and its Politburo.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program was published yesterday; in it the party sets forth what it seeks, what it is striving for, what it is struggling for. We must all study this very important theoretical and political document in depth and understand it. The draft new edition of the CPSU Program, which has been presented for partywide and nationwide discussion, is called upon to arm Communists and all Soviet people with a profound, clear, and accurate understanding of the main tasks of our political, economic, social, and cultural development, the further strengthening of our motherland's defense might, and the strengthening of the USSR's international positions and international influence as the bastion of peace and socialism on earth.

In the next 15 years, M.V. Zimyanin went on, we must double the country's production potential.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary noted that the Elektronika association is in the forefront of the country's technical progress. All Communists and all working people at the enterprise must work with a profound awareness of their responsibility for the country's destiny and for its progress.

Especially since electronics, like machine building and instrument making in general, is among the priority avenues and forms the basis of the retooling of our industry and agriculture.

At the same time, the speaker said, there are great reserves inherent in the rapid pace of your forward movement. You must raise all your work to a qualitatively new level. First, it is a question of the need to systematically fulfill plan targets in every respect. Second, there is the need to utilize all the potential for further accelerating scientific and technical progress. And, last, there is the very important task of increasing labor productivity. There are considerable reserves here -- the fullest possible savings of materials, raw materials, electricity, financial resources, and labor, the full utilization of equipment, and the strengthening of socialist discipline and order.

The report and election campaign is under way in the CPSU now. It will now involve the discussion of the party's program materials, a profound restructuring of all party work and all the public consciousness, the entry onto new paths and bold new creative solutions, and the raising of the overall level of our ideological and mass political work to the level of present-day demands.

Our people are highly conscious and have been educated in the ideas of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism. All our motherland's nations and ethnic groups are rallied into a single harmonious family in the struggle for the noble, humane, just ideas of Marxism-Leninism. All this must be further embodied and developed in daily work. It is particularly important to ensure attentiveness toward every Soviet person, especially young people, and to display concern for raising the people's ideological and political level and professional qualifications and improving their level of information and their cultural and technical standard. We can be proud of our young people, and must raise them carefully and solicitously and direct them along the path of an increasingly profound mastery of knowledge and high skills, inculcating a sense of duty to the motherland and lofty moral and ethical qualities.

M.V. Zimyanin noted the importance of resolving the tasks of all-around improvement of party, state, and economic leadership. We seek, he said, to rationalize it in such a way that it accords to the highest degree with the present-day demands of production, science, and technology. The restructuring of state and economic leadership is proceeding in such a way as to extend the rights and increase the responsibility of local organs of power, state, soviet, and economic organs, enterprises, and labor collectives while preserving the centralized principle and following the Leninist principle of democratic centralism.

All this means further progress along the path of developing socialist democracy and involving increasingly broad masses of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and intelligentsia in the management of all the state's and society's affairs. This is an integral part of the strategic course which our party is pursuing and which is being implemented increasingly persistently, consistently, and profoundly by the Leninist Central Committee.

M.V. Zimyanin went on to dwell on questions of the foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state. He stressed that the new peace initiatives put forward by our party are aimed at improving the international situation, and above all at preventing the militarization of outer space, reducing nuclear arms, and preserving and consolidating world peace.

In conclusion the CPSU Central Committee secretary wished the party organization and the entire collective of the association the successful completion of this year's production program and the creation of the necessary prerequisites for highly productive labor in the 12th 5-Year Plan.

During his stay in Voronezh 24-26 October, M.V. Zimyanin familiarized himself with production at the Elektronika association and inquired about the course of implementation of the program for the technical renewal of the enterprise and the state of political education work in the collective. In conversations with workers and specialists questions of the construction of social facilities and of improving people's working, living, and leisure conditions were touched on.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee visited the Polytechnical Institute and talked with its teachers and students and with the city's VUZ aktiv. He familiarized himself with the work of the interschool production and training combine in Kominternovskiy Rayon and inspected trade enterprises.

A talk took place in the oblast party committee.

M.V. Zimyanin laid flowers at the monument to Soviet servicemen who took part in the fighting for the Chizhovskiy bridgehead.

M.V. Zimyanin was accompanied by V.N. Ignatov, first secretary of Voronezh CPSU Obkom, and A.M. Voropayev, chairman of the oblispolkom.

SOKOLOV TO REVIEW GOSR PARADE ON 7 NOV

LD012140 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2104 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] at 1000 on 7 November, the day of the 68th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in the capital in Red Square a parade of the troops of the Moscow Garrison is scheduled. The parade will be reviewed by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolov, USSR minister of Defense.

RSFSR SUPREME SOVIET TO MEET 3 DEC

LD011242 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1218 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, 1 Nov (TASS) -- The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has decided to convene the second session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation on 3 December 1985 in Moscow.

YELTSIN VISITS ASTRAKHAN, CONSTRUCTION SITES

LD022208 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Ways to solve problems connected with speeding up the development of Astrakhan Oblast and city, and of developing oil and gas wealth in the region on the basis of the further industrialization of capital construction were reviewed during the 1-2 November our of Astrakhan Oblast by Comrade Yeltsin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Cormade Yeltsin toured a unique gas complex which is under construction near Astrakhan. A meeting of the aktiv of the complex has adopted measures aimed at rapidly overcoming construction delays and at completing projects due for commissioning.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited a fiberglass plant, power engineering and construction indsutry enterprises and other sites. Note was made of the inadequate preparedness of a number of installations for work in winter conditions. Comrade Yeltsin conversed with workers, brigade leaders and engineering-technical workers, and took an interest in their labor, living and rest conditions, medical service, and trade and public catering organization. During a meeting with the oblast's Party and economic aktiv, main attention was concentrated on the further development of the city of Astrakhan, raising construction rates for dwellings and tasks for successfully completing targets for the 5-year plan period as a whole. The important significance of the active participation of Communists in discussing the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program and the draft of the new CPSU Statutes and meet the forthcoming 27th Party Congress.

COUNCIL OF MINISTER APPOINTMENTS REPORTED

Silayev as Deputy premier

LD021639 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Excerpt] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Ivan Stepanovich Silayev as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, relieving him of the post of minister of aviation industry.

Apollon Sergeyevich Systsev is appointed minister of that industry.

Ivan Stepanovich Silayev was born in 1930. He is a Russian, and a member of the CPSU since 1959. He graduated from Kazan Aviation Institute. He began work as a foreman at Ordzhonikidze aircraft works in Gorkiy, later becoming shop leader, chief engineer, and manager of that works. In 1974 he was appointed deputy, and in 1977, first deputy minister of aviation industry. From 1980, he was USSR minister of machine-tool and instrument-making industry; and from 1981, USSR minister of aviation industry.

At the 26th party congress, Comrade Silayev was elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee. He is a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet and a hero of socialist labor. He is a winner of the Lenin Prize.

Murakhovskiy as Deputy Chairman

LD011635 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has decided to appoint Vsevolod Serafimovich Murakhovskiy as first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Ziya Nuriyevich Nuriyev from his duties as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers in connection with his retirement on pension.

Antonov Named Envoy to CEMA

LD031424 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 3 TASS -- The Council of Ministers of the USSR endorsed Aleksey Antonov, a deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, as the USSR's permanent representative to the Council for Mutual Economic and relieved Nikolay Talyzin of these duties in connection with his transfer to another job.

COSMONAUTS CONTINUE FLIGHT PROGRAM EXPERIMENTS

LD012335 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 1 TASS -- Vladimir Vasyutin and Aleksandr Volkov have been in orbital flight for a month and a half now, while flight engineer Viktor Savinykh has worked in outer space for 149 days.

Over the past two days, the cosmonauts have carried out a fresh series of experiments to determine the spectral and optical characteristics of the earth's atmosphere and carried out medical and biochemical research.

On today's programme are biological experiments with higher plants cultivated on board the orbital complex, visual observations and photography of some areas of the world ocean, and physical exercises.

There is also time for rest.

According to the figures of telemetric measurements and reports of the crew, the on-board systems of the manned complex "Salyut-7" -- "Soyuz T-14" -- "Cosmos-1686" are functioning normally.

Cosmonauts Vasyutin, Savinykh and Volkov continue fulfilling the flight programme.

SCIENTISTS TO EXPLORE ANTARCTICA'S D CUPOLA

LD021155 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Leningrad, November 1 TASS -- Soviet scientists are to undertake through drilling of Antarctica's ice "cap" in the so-called "'D' cupola" in the area which is the most remote one from the sea shores. The task is entrusted with the participants in the new, 31st, Soviet Antarctic expedition. Today, a large group of polar explorers from the expedition departed from Leningrad on board the diesel-electric ship "Kapitan Bondarenko".

Professor Yevgeniy Korotkevich, who is in charge of the Soviet Antarctic programme and was awarded the title of the hero of socialist labour, the highest in the USSR, for his exploration of the "white continent," said that the new expedition is the largest by the number of its participants. It involved more than 600 scientists and specialists, including Soviet polar explorers' foreign colleagues from the German Democratic Republic, Cuba, and other countries.

Apart from the traditional programme of comprehensive observations over the nature of the south-polar continent, scientists expand their research into the geological structure of Antarctica's western part and oceanological work in the waters of the Pacific sector which are poorly explored so far.

The transportation of the participants in the expedition by the Leningrad-Antarctica via Maputo (Mozambique) air bridge went under way in line with the plans of the new expedition. The transport "Baikal" is heading for the ince continent from Vladivostok. The Soviet antarctic flotilla involves a total of seven ships. The flagship "Mikhail Somov," which withstood the unparalelled Antarctic drift last summer, is also to sail out into the sea following the completion of repair work.

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES PRESIDIUM MEETS 31 OCT

LD020653 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Oct 85

[Text] The vigorous activity by the many-million strong army of Soviet scientists is an enormous reserve for increasing the success of all the economic and social life of the country. Questions on the growth of the role of science in the resolution of the tasks set at the October Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee were discussed at the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences which took place today. Academician Aleksandrov, the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who opened the meeting, commented that in the forthcoming five-year plan, it is envisaged to sharply heighten the role of the Academy of Sciences as the coordinator of all scientific research work in the country, to strengthen its responsibility for the creation of the theoretical foundations for fundamentally new forms of equipment and technology. Vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences Academician Fedoseyev gave a report at the meeting. He dwelled on the k y positions of the draft of the new CPSU program and stressed that in this document is formulated and substantiated the strategy of the party on fundamental questions of domestic and foreign policy. Scientists who had taken part in the debate expressed proposals directed at improving the organization and the content of scientific research.

BRIEFS

LAPTEV SEA EXPLORATION -- An expedition of geologists has successfully conducted a series of seismic observations in the Laptev Sea, as the beginning of a systematic study of the Eastern sector of the Arctic Shelf. From now on the expedition will become an annual one. [Summary] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 2 Nov 85 LD]

NUCLEAR POWER INSTITUTE OPENS -- An institute of the Nuclear Power Industry opened today in Obninsk. It is the first of its kind in the USSR, and will train specialists in the designing, assembly and running of atomic electric power stations, as well as helping existing AES workers to add to their qualifications. An academic village will be built for more than 2,000 students. The new institute is based at the well-established Obninsk branch of Moscow Institute of Engineering and Physics. [Summary] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 1 Nov 85 LD]

YEREVAN ATOMIC ENERGY MEETING -- The 7th Session of the Scientific Council for the use of atomic energy and technology of the Presidium of the Armenian Academy of Sciences has been held in Yerevan. It was devoted to raising the level of expertise and the all-round training of the personnel serving in atomic power stations. A report by Abaghyan, chief director of the Energiya scientific production association of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, noted that currently training centers are being planned and being created at the largest atomic and thermal power stations throughout the country. The members of the Armenian branch of the All-union Atomic Energy Association and the Atomic Power Station Research Institute are actively participating in this work. [passage indistinct] Andranik Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the use of atomic energy and academician of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, participated in the work of the session. [Text] [Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2130 GMT 30 Oct 85 LD]